

Department of Education
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS
Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Request

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Appropriations language	C-1
Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes	C-3
Amounts Available for Obligation	C-7
Obligations by Object Classification	C-8
Summary of Changes	C-9
Authorizing Legislation	C-10
Appropriations History	C-13
Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports	C-14
Summary of Request	C-15
Improving teacher quality:	
Improving teacher quality State grants	C-18
Mathematics and science partnerships	C-27
Educational technology State grants	C-33
21 st century community learning centers	C-41
Javits gifted and talented education	C-48
Foreign language assistance	C-53
State assessments	C-59
Education for homeless children and youths	C-66
Education for Native Hawaiians	C-71
Alaska Native education equity	C-74
Training and advisory services	C-78
Rural education	C-83
Supplemental education grants	C-92
Comprehensive centers	C-95
State Tables	C-100

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

For carrying out school improvement activities authorized by parts A, B, and D of title II, part B of title IV, [subparts 6 and]¹ subpart 9 of part D of title V, parts A and B of title VI, and parts B and C of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 ("ESEA"); the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002; the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003; and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, [\$5,362,016,000] \$5,182,181,000, of which [\$3,495,865,000] \$3,325,993,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009] 2010, and remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011,² and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] 2010, and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] 2011³ for academic year [2009-2010] 2010-2011: *Provided*, That [of the funds available for section 2103(a) of the ESEA, \$5,000,000 shall be available for a school leadership partnership initiative and up to \$7,500,000 shall be available for teacher and principal quality national activities administered by the Secretary of Education, as specified in the explanatory statement described in section 4 (in the matter preceding division A of this consolidated Act):⁴ *Provided further*, That] funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation and modernization of [any] public elementary [school,] schools, public secondary [school, or structure] schools, and structures related to [an] public elementary [school or] schools and secondary [school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body: *Provided further*, That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii for the activities described in such proviso, and \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law] schools, if such construction, renovation, or modernization would support achievement of the purposes of that part:⁵ *Provided further*, That funds made available to carry

out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction:⁶ Provided further, That the Secretary shall implement part C of title VII of the ESEA without regard to the requirements of section 7304(d)(2):⁷ *Provided further, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act:*⁸ *Provided further, That \$57,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:*⁹ *Provided further, That [\$33,791,000] \$26,328,000 shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:*¹⁰ *Provided further, That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:*¹¹ *Provided further, That \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:*¹² *Provided further, That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services:*¹³ *Provided further, That [\$7,360,000] \$9,360,000 of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages.*¹⁴ (*Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2009.*)

NOTE

Each language provision that is followed by a footnote reference is explained in the Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes document which follows the appropriations language.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹ ...[subparts 6 and]...	This language, which provides funds for Javits Gifted and Talented Education, is deleted because the Administration is not requesting funds for the program.
² ... of which [\$3,495,865,000] \$3,325,993,000 shall become available on July 1, [2009] <u>2010</u> , and remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u> ,...	This language provides for a portion of funds to be appropriated on a forward-funded basis for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Mathematics and Science Partnerships, Educational Technology State Grants, 21 st Century Community Learning Centers, State Assessments, Education for Homeless Children and Youths, and Rural Education.
³ ... and of which \$1,681,441,000 shall become available on October 1, [2009] <u>2010</u> , and shall remain available through September 30, [2010] <u>2011</u> ,...	This language provides that a portion of funds for Improving Teacher Quality State Grants is available on an advance-funded basis.
⁴ <i>Provided</i> , [That of the funds available for section 2103(a) of the ESEA, \$5,000,000 shall be available for a school leadership partnership initiative and up to \$7,500,000 shall be available for teacher and principal quality national activities administered by the Secretary of Education, as specified in the explanatory statement described in section 4 (in the matter preceding division A of this consolidated Act):	This language, which earmarks funds for a school leadership partnership initiative and teacher and principal national activities under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, is deleted because activities to enhance teacher and principal quality can be carried out through other programs, including School Leadership, Teacher Quality Enhancement, and the Teacher Incentive Fund.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
<p>⁵ ... funds made available to carry out part B of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction, renovation and modernization of [any] <u>public</u> elementary [school,] <u>schools, public</u> secondary [school, or structure] <u>schools, and structures</u> related to [an] <u>public</u> elementary [school or] <u>schools and</u> secondary [school, run by the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii, that serves a predominantly Native Hawaiian student body: <i>Provided further</i>, That from the funds referred to in the preceding proviso, not less than \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the Department of Education of the State of Hawaii for the activities described in such proviso, and \$1,500,000 shall be for a grant to the University of Hawaii School of Law for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian law] <u>schools, if such construction, renovation, or modernization would support achievement of the purposes of that part:</u></p>	<p>This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for school construction, renovation, and modernization. This language is changed to provide that program funds may be used for construction, renovation, and modernization of public schools if such activities would support the purposes of the program. This language also earmarks funds appropriated for the Education for Native Hawaiians program for specified grants. The language is deleted because the Administration does not believe that funds for competitive grant programs should be earmarked for specific entities.</p>
<p>⁶ <i>Provided further</i>, That funds made available to carry out part C of title VII of the ESEA may be used for construction:</p>	<p>This language authorizes the use of funds appropriated for the Alaska Native Education Equity program for construction.</p>
<p>⁷ <u><i>Provided further</i>, That the Secretary shall implement part C of title VII of the ESEA without regard to the requirements of section 7304(d)(2):</u></p>	<p>This language allows the Secretary to implement the Alaska Native Education Equity program without regard to earmarks included in the program's authorizing statute. The language is included because the Administration does not believe that funds for competitive grant programs should be earmarked for specific entities.</p>
<p>⁸ <i>Provided further</i>, That up to 100 percent of the funds available to a State educational agency under part D of title II of the ESEA may be used for subgrants described in section 2412(a)(2)(B) of such Act:</p>	<p>This language allows States to award up to 100 percent of subgrant funds competitively to local educational agencies under the Educational Technology State Grants program.</p>

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
⁹ <i>Provided further</i> , That \$57,113,000 shall be available to carry out section 203 of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002:	This language specifies the funding level for the Comprehensive Centers program.
¹⁰ <i>Provided further</i> , That [\$33,791,000] <u>\$26,328,000</u> shall be available to carry out part D of title V of the ESEA:	This language specifies the funding level for the Foreign Language Assistance program.
¹¹ <i>Provided further</i> , That no funds appropriated under this heading may be used to carry out section 5494 under the ESEA:	This language prohibits funds appropriated for the Foreign Language Assistance program from being used for Elementary School Foreign Language Incentive Grants.
¹² <i>Provided further</i> , That \$17,687,000 shall be available to carry out the Supplemental Education Grants program for the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands:	This language specifies the funding level for Supplemental Education Grants to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands.
¹³ <i>Provided further</i> , That up to 5 percent of these amounts may be reserved by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to administer the Supplemental Education Grants programs and to obtain technical assistance, oversight and consultancy services in the administration of these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for such services:	This language allows the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands to reserve up to 5 percent of their Supplemental Education Grants funds for administration and for technical assistance, oversight, and consultancy services for these grants and to reimburse the United States Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education for these services.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Analysis of Language Provisions and Changes

Language Provision	Explanation
¹⁴ <i>Provided further</i> , That [\$7,360,000] <u>\$9,360,000</u> of the funds available for the Foreign Language Assistance Program shall be available for 5-year grants to local educational agencies that would work in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education to establish or expand articulated programs of study in languages critical to United States national security that will enable successful students to advance from elementary school through college to achieve a superior level of proficiency in those languages.	This language provides funding under the Foreign Language Assistance program for 5-year grants to local educational agencies in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs) to enable students to study languages critical to United States national and economic security in an articulated program of study that helps students become proficient in those languages.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Amounts Available for Obligation (\$000s)

	2008	2009	2010
Discretionary authority:			
Annual appropriation	\$5,383,119	\$5,362,016	\$5,182,181
Across-the board reduction	<u>-94,043</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, appropriation.....	5,289,076	5,362,016	5,182,181
Supplemental (PL 110-329)	15,000	0	0
Recovery Act supplemental (PL 111-5)	0	720,000	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	-1,435,000	-1,681,441	-1,681,441
Advance from prior year	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,435,000</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>
Subtotal, budget authority	5,304,076	5,835,575	5,182,181
Unobligated balance, start of year	63,445	62,683	0
Recovery of prior-year obligations	96	0	0
Unobligated balance, expiring.....	-198	0	0
Unobligated balance, end of year	<u>-62,683</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Subtotal, direct obligations.....	5,304,736	5,178,258	5,182,181
Subtotal, Recovery Act direct obligations.....	<u>0</u>	<u>720,000</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations	5,304,736	5,898,258	5,182,181

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Obligations by Object Classification (\$000s)

	2008	2009	2010
Printing and reproduction.....	\$62	0	0
Other contractual services:			
Advisory and assistance services	6,459	\$43,648	\$27,740
Other services	17,983	0	0
Peer review	37	479	469
Purchases of goods and services	18	20	20
Research and Development	<u>2,381</u>	<u>1,941</u>	<u>1,941</u>
Subtotal	26,878	46,088	30,170
Grants, subsidies, and contributions.....	5,277,794	5,132,170	5,152,011
Grants, Recovery Act.....	0	720,000	0
Interest and dividends.....	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, direct obligations.....	5,304,736	5,898,258	5,182,181

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Changes (\$000s)

2009	\$5,362,016
2009 Recovery Act (non-add)	(720,000)
2010	<u>5,182,181</u>
Net change.....	-179,835

	<u>2009 base</u>	<u>Change from base</u>
Decreases:		
<u>Program:</u> Decrease funding for Educational Technology State Grants because States should have significant funds remaining from the Recovery Act available for use through the 2010-2011 school year.	\$269,872	-\$169,872
Eliminate funding for Javits Gifted and Talented Education because it is a small Federal program with limited impact and evidence of effectiveness.	7,463	-7,463
Decrease funding for Training and Advisory Services to eliminate funding included in the fiscal year 2009 appropriation for a special, one-time competition for LEAs implementing new student assignment plans in compliance with the Supreme Court decision.	9,489	<u>- 2,500</u>
Subtotal, decreases		-179,835
Net change		-179,835

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation (\$000s)

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Improving teacher quality (<i>ESEA II</i>):				
Improving teacher quality State grants (<i>Part A</i>)	0 ¹	\$2,947,749	0 ¹	\$2,947,749
Mathematics and science partnerships (<i>Part B</i>)	0 ¹	178,978	0 ¹	178,978
Educational technology State grants (<i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i>)	0 ^{1,2}	269,872	0 ^{1,2}	100,000
21 st century community learning centers (<i>ESEA IV-B</i>)	0 ¹	1,131,166	0 ¹	1,131,166
Javits gifted and talented education (<i>ESEA V-D-6</i>)	0 ³	7,463	0 ³	0
Foreign language assistance (<i>ESEA V-D-9</i>)	0 ¹	26,328	0 ¹	26,328
State assessments (<i>ESEA VI-A-1</i>)	0	410,732	0 ¹	410,732
Education for homeless children and youths (<i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i>)	0	65,427	0 ¹	65,427
Education for Native Hawaiians (<i>ESEA VII-B</i>)	0 ^{1,4}	33,315	0 ^{1,4}	33,315
Alaska Native education equity (<i>ESEA VII-C</i>)	0 ^{1,5}	33,315	0 ^{1,5}	33,315
Training and advisory services (<i>CRA IV</i>)	0	9,489	0	6,989
Rural education (<i>ESEA VI-B</i>)	0 ^{1,6}	173,382	0 ^{1,6}	173,382
Supplemental education grants (<i>Compact of Free Association Act</i>)	\$19,623 ⁷	17,687	\$19,835 ⁷	17,687
Comprehensive centers (<i>Educational Technical Assistance Act, Section 203</i>)	0 ¹	57,113	0 ¹	57,113
Recovery Act – Educational technology State grants (<i>ESEA II-D-1 and 2</i>) (<i>non-add</i>)	0 ⁸	650,000	0	0
Recovery Act – Education for homeless children and youths (<i>McKinney-Vento Act, Title VII-B</i>) (<i>non-add</i>)	0 ⁸	70,000	0	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

Activity		2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
<u>Unfunded authorizations:</u>					
C-11	Special education teacher training (ESEA, Section 2151(d))	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
	Early childhood educator professional development (ESEA, Section 2151(e))	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
	Teacher mobility (ESEA, Section 2151(f))	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
	State grants for innovative programs (ESEA, V-A)	0 ⁹	0	0 ⁹	0
	Promising practices in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teaching (America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Subtitle A-III)	Indefinite ¹⁰	0	0 ¹⁰	0
	Math now for elementary school and middle school students (America COMPETES Act, Section 6201)	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	0
	Summer term education programs (America COMPETES Act, Section 6202)	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	0
	Math skills for secondary school students (America COMPETES Act, Section 6203)	\$95,000	0	\$95,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Authorizing Legislation—continued (\$000s)

Activity	2009 Authorized	2009 Estimate	2010 Authorized	2010 Request
Foreign language partnership program <i>(America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Subtitle C)</i>	Indefinite	0	Indefinite	0
Mathematics and science partnership bonus grants <i>(America COMPETES Act, Title VI, Subtitle E)</i>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Indefinite</u>	<u>0</u>
Total, definite authorization	\$114,623		\$114,623	
Total, annual appropriation		\$5,382,016		\$5,182,181
Portion of request subject to reauthorization				5,157,505

¹ The program is authorized in fiscal year 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

² Section 2404 of the ESEA requires that from the funds appropriated for Subparts 1 and 2 of Part D, at least 98 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 1 and not more than 2 percent is to be used to carry out Subpart 2.

³ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in fiscal year 2009 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language for fiscal year 2010 nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

⁴ Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

⁵ Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

⁶ The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

⁷ The Compact of Free Association Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any one year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The 2010 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2008.

⁸ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The program is authorized in fiscal year 2009 through appropriations language.

⁹ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2008. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

¹⁰ The GEPA extension expired September 30, 2009. The Administration is not seeking reauthorizing legislation.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations History (\$000s)

	Budget Estimate to Congress	House Allowance	Senate Allowance	Appropriation
2001 (2001 Advance for 2002)	\$3,869,034 (1,515,000)	\$3,165,334 (1,515,000)	\$4,672,534 (2,915,000)	\$4,869,084 (1,765,000)
2002 (2002 Advance for 2003)	6,338,794 0	7,653,084 (1,960,000)	8,754,514 (1,765,000)	7,837,473 (1,765,000)
2003 (2003 Advance for 2004) 2003 Technical amendment	6,784,484 (1,765,000) 0	7,347,584 (2,265,000) 0	7,788,329 (1,765,000) 0	8,001,159 (1,765,000) 546
2004 (2004 Advance for 2005)	5,042,834 (1,435,000)	5,797,637 (1,435,000)	5,731,453 (1,435,000)	5,800,496 (1,435,000)
2005 (2005 Advance for 2006)	5,940,493 (1,435,000)	5,661,401 (1,435,000)	5,730,632 (1,435,000)	5,619,657 (1,435,000)
2006 (2006 Advance for 2007)	5,332,219 (1,435,000)	5,393,765 (1,435,000)	5,457,953 (1,435,000)	5,255,478 (1,435,000)
2007 (2007 Advance for 2008)	4,973,158 (1,435,000)	N/A ¹	N/A ¹	5,255,478 ¹ (1,435,000)
2008 (2008 Advance for 2009) Supp. (PL 110-329)	4,698,276 (1,435,000) 0	5,693,668 (1,435,000) 0	5,198,525 (1,435,000) 0	5,289,076 (1,435,000) 15,000
2009 (2009 Advance for 2010) Recovery Act Supp. (PL 111-5)	4,566,323 (1,435,000) 0	5,399,609 ² (1,435,000) 1,066,000	5,292,422 ² (1,435,000) 1,070,000	5,362,016 (1,681,441) 720,000
2010 (2010 Advance for 2011)	5,182,181 (1,681,441)			

¹ This account operated under a full-year continuing resolution (P.L. 110-5). House and Senate Allowance amounts are shown as N/A (Not Available) because neither body passed a separate appropriations bill.

² The levels for the House and Senate allowances reflect action on the regular annual 2009 appropriations bill, which proceeded in the 110th Congress only through the House Subcommittee and the Senate Committee.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Significant Items in FY 2009 Appropriations Reports

21st Century Community Learning Centers

- House: The Committee intends that the Department encourage States to use 40 percent of their additional allocations over the fiscal year 2008 funding level, as practicable, to provide supervised and supportive after-school activities to more middle- and high-school students.
- Conference: The Appropriations Committees intend that the Department encourage States to use 40 percent of their additional allocations over the fiscal year 2008 funding level to provide supervised and supportive after-school activities to middle- and high-school students.
- Response: The Department sent State Coordinators an e-mail to encourage them to use 40 percent of the 2009 increase on programs that serve middle and high school students.

Foreign Language Assistance

- Senate: The Committee strongly urges the Department to waive the matching requirement for qualifying schools and to increase awareness of this accommodation among the affected school population.
- Response: The Department will continue to make eligible applicants aware of the Secretary's authority to waive the matching requirement for qualifying grantees.

State Assessments

- Senate: The Committee urges the Department to continue to place a high priority on grant applications that aim to improve the quality of State assessments for students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency, and to ensure the most accurate means of measuring their performance on these assessments.
- Response: The Department has established a competitive preference for grant applications that propose to address the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2010 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST

(in thousands of dollars)		Category Code	2008 Appropriation	2009 Appropriation	2010 President's Request	Change from 2009 Appropriation	
Office, Account, Program and Activity						Amount	Percent
School Improvement Programs							
1. Improving teacher quality (ESEA II):							
(a) Improving teacher quality State grants (Part A)							
Annual appropriation		D	1,500,248	1,266,308	1,266,308	0	0.0%
Advance for succeeding fiscal year		D	1,435,000	1,681,441	1,681,441	0	0.0%
Subtotal		D	2,935,248	2,947,749	2,947,749	0	0.0%
(b) Mathematics and science partnerships (Part B)							
		D	178,978	178,978	178,978	0	0.0%
2. Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)		D	267,494	269,872	100,000	(169,872)	-62.9%
3. 21st century community learning centers (ESEA IV-B)		D	1,081,166	1,131,166	1,131,166	0	0.0%
4. Javits gifted and talented education (ESEA V-D, subpart 6)		D	7,463	7,463	0	(7,463)	-100.0%
5. Foreign language assistance (ESEA V-D, subpart 9)		D	25,655	26,328	26,328	0	0.0%
6. State assessments (ESEA VI-A-1)		D	408,732	410,732	410,732	0	0.0%
7. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)		D	64,067	65,427	65,427	0	0.0%
8. Emergency funds for homeless students (Disaster Relief and Recovery Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2008, P.L. 110-329, Division B, I-7)		D	15,000	0	0	0	---
9. Education for Native Hawaiians (ESEA VII-B)		D	33,315	33,315	33,315	0	0.0%
10. Alaska Native education equity (ESEA VII-C)		D	33,315	33,315	33,315	0	0.0%
11. Training and advisory services (CRA IV)		D	6,989	9,489	6,989	(2,500)	-26.3%
12. Rural education (ESEA VI-B)		D	171,854	173,382	173,382	0	0.0%
13. Supplemental education grants (Compact of Free Association Act)		D	17,687	17,687	17,687	0	0.0%
14. Comprehensive centers (ETAA section 203)		D	57,113	57,113	57,113	0	0.0%
Total, Appropriation		D	5,304,076	5,362,016	5,182,181	(179,835)	-3.4%
Total, Budget authority		D	5,304,076	5,115,575	5,182,181	66,606	1.3%
Current			3,869,076 ¹	3,680,575 ²	3,500,740 ²	(179,835)	-4.9%
Prior year's advance			1,435,000	1,435,000	1,681,441	246,441	17.2%
Outlays		D	5,365,099	5,208,591	5,304,452	95,861	1.8%
School Improvement Programs, Recovery Act							
1. Educational technology State grants (ESEA II-D-1 and 2)		D	0	650,000	0	(650,000)	-100.0%
2. Education for homeless children and youths (MVHAA Title VII-B)		D	0	70,000	0	(70,000)	-100.0%
Total		D	0	720,000	0	(720,000)	-100.0%
Outlays		D	0	13,680	417,600	403,920	2952.6%

¹ Excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,435,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

² Excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,681,441 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

NOTES: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.
FY 2008 detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

School Improvement Programs provide support for State and local efforts to implement the reforms and educational improvements called for in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). More specifically, the activities in this account provide flexible resources to improve teacher quality; improve mathematics, science, and foreign language instruction; support before- and after-school programs; and pay the costs of developing and administering assessments. The account also includes a variety of smaller programs addressing particular educational needs or special populations.

The Administration is requesting a total of \$5.2 billion for programs in this account, \$179.8 million less than the 2009 level. The reduction represents requests for the elimination of funding for the **Javits Gifted and Talented Education** program, and decreases in funding for the **Educational Technology State Grants** and **Training and Advisory Services** programs.

The largest activity in the account is the **Improving Teacher Quality State Grants** program. Using program resources, States and LEAs implement high-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs and other strategies to ensure that our Nation's schools are staffed with fully qualified teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. The Administration is requesting \$2.9 billion for this program, the same as the 2009 level. The requested funds will help maintain the momentum for ensuring that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

In addition, the Administration is seeking \$179 million for **Mathematics and Science Partnerships**, the same amount as the 2009 appropriation, to support State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by strengthening the content knowledge and teaching skills of elementary and secondary school teachers. Funding at the requested level will allow funded partnerships to continue actions to improve students' mathematics and science achievement.

The Administration requests \$1.1 billion for the **21st Century Community Learning Centers** program, the same as the 2009 appropriation. Funds will continue to support communities as they establish or expand centers that provide extended student learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, and provide related services to families.

The Administration requests \$26.3 million for the **Foreign Language Assistance** program, the same as the fiscal year 2009 appropriation. This request would support the goal of all students learning a second language and is consistent with other Federal investments that support the expansion of K-12 and postsecondary instruction in critical and other foreign languages.

The Administration is also requesting level funding for **Education for Homeless Children and Youths**, at \$65.4 million, which helps to ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children; and for **Comprehensive Centers**, at \$57.1 million, which would continue supporting funding for comprehensive technical assistance to grantees under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Summary of Request

The Administration seeks \$410.7 million for **State Assessments**, the same amount as the fiscal year 2009 level, to support the President's goal of spurring a "race to the top," and ending what has become a race to the bottom in American education, by encouraging States to strengthen their State academic content and achievement standards, including by establishing rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments that are valid and reliable for all students. The request includes \$400 million for State formula grants and \$10.7 million for awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program.

The Administration also requests \$173.4 million for **Rural Education**, which provides additional resources to rural LEAs and schools that often face unique challenges in implementing ESEA; \$33.3 million for **Education for Native Hawaiians**; \$33.3 million for **Alaska Native Education Equity**; and \$17.7 million for **Supplemental Education Grants**. The requests for all four of these programs would continue funding at fiscal year 2009 levels.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part A)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$1,266,308	\$1,266,308	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>1,681,441</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	2,947,749	2,947,749	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants provide funds to State educational agencies (SEAs) and local educational agencies (LEAs) to develop and support a high-quality teaching force through activities that are grounded in scientifically based research. The program gives States and LEAs a flexible source of funding with which to meet their particular needs in strengthening the skills and knowledge of teachers and principals to enable them to improve student achievement in the core academic subjects. In return for this flexibility, LEAs are required to demonstrate annual progress in ensuring that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects within the State are highly qualified and that increasing numbers of teachers are receiving high-quality professional development.

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds are distributed by formula. Each State receives the amount of funds that it received from the antecedent Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs in fiscal year 2001. Remaining funds are then allocated to States by formula based 35 percent on States' relative share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 65 percent on States' relative share of poor children aged 5 to 17, with each State receiving at least one-half of 1 percent of these remaining funds. The Bureau of Indian Education in the Department of the Interior and the Outlying Areas each receive one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation.

Each State must allocate 95 percent of its funds for Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies; 2.5 percent or the State's share of \$125 million, whichever is less, for Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships; and the remainder for State-level activities. States may use their State-level funds for a variety of activities, including the reform of teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements, teacher mentoring, creation or improvement of alternative routes to certification, teacher recruitment and retention programs, tenure reform, professional development for teachers and principals, technical assistance to LEAs, activities to promote reciprocity of teacher and principal certification or licensing, performance-based compensation systems, and pay differentiation programs.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

The State awards Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies using a formula that is similar to the one that the Department uses for State allocations, except that, after LEAs receive the amount equivalent to their 2001 allocations from the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants and Class Size Reduction programs, remaining funds are then allocated to LEAs by a formula based 20 percent on LEAs' share of the population aged 5 to 17 and 80 percent on LEAs' share of poor children aged 5 to 17. In addition to using these funds for professional development and class-size reduction, LEAs may use program funds for other activities to improve teacher quality, including teacher and principal recruitment and retention initiatives, signing bonuses and other financial incentives, teacher and principal mentoring, reforming tenure systems, merit pay, teacher testing, and pay differentiation initiatives.

Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships are awarded competitively by the State agency for higher education working in conjunction with the SEA. Eligible partnerships must include an institution of higher education and the division of the institution that prepares teachers and principals, a school of arts and sciences, and a high-need LEA; other entities are allowable members of the partnership. Partnerships that receive a subgrant must use the funds to provide professional development in the core academic subjects to teachers, highly qualified paraprofessionals, and, if appropriate, principals.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required all SEAs receiving Title I, Part A funds to develop a plan to have all public school teachers of core academic subjects meet the highly qualified teacher requirements no later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. "Highly qualified" means that the teacher: (1) has obtained full State certification as a teacher; (2) holds a minimum of a bachelor's degree; and (3) has demonstrated subject-matter competency in each of the academic subjects in which he or she teaches. LEAs have commonly used their Improving Teacher Quality State Grants funds to help enable teachers to meet this requirement.

In the fiscal year 2009 appropriation authorization, Congress directed the Department to use \$5 million of that year's appropriation for a school leadership partnership initiative and up to \$7.5 million for teacher and principal quality national activities.

This is a forward-funded program that includes advance appropriations. A portion of the funds becomes available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remains available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The remaining funds become available on October 1 of the fiscal year following the appropriations act and remain available for 12 months, expiring at the same time as the forward-funded portion.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$2,916,605
2006.....	2,887,439
2007.....	2,887,439
2008.....	2,935,248
2009.....	2,947,749

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration is requesting \$2.9 billion for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, the same as the 2009 level. States and LEAs will use program resources to implement high-quality recruitment, professional development, and induction programs and other strategies to ensure that our Nation's high-poverty schools are staffed with fully qualified teachers who are prepared to help all children succeed academically. The requested funds will help maintain the momentum for ensuring that all children are taught by teachers who have expertise in the subjects they teach and the skills needed to teach effectively.

Continued funding for this program will also support the goals of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and Administration priorities. For example, the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) authorized in the ARRA shares two key objectives with Improving Teacher Quality State Grants: (1) improving teacher effectiveness, and (2) ensuring that all schools have highly qualified teachers. Moreover, States spending Improving Teacher Quality State Grants effectively will be more competitive in applying for Race-to-the-Top (RTTT) discretionary awards, which will be made with \$4.4 billion of the SFSF based in part on how well each State is using the first round of SFSF and Title I funds to advance education reforms.

The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers has increased over the past 5 years. A recent survey of school districts conducted by the Department found that 94 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in 2006-2007, an increase of more than 7 percentage points from 2003-04. However, some schools, especially schools that are high-poverty, continue to struggle to meet the highly qualified teacher requirements. In 2006-07, only 94 percent of elementary school classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher in high-poverty schools, compared to 97 percent of classes in low-poverty schools. At the secondary-school level, the percentages were 89 percent and 95 percent for high-poverty and low-poverty schools, respectively. To help close this gap, the Department has recently focused its work with States and school districts on ensuring that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children.

It is crucial for all students to be taught by highly qualified teachers who are fully credentialed and knowledgeable about the subjects they teach. Research by Eric Hanushek of Stanford University indicates that the quality of classroom teachers is the most important factor under school control that affects student achievement. In addition, value-added assessment studies by William Sanders of the SAS Institute indicate that individual teachers make a significant difference in student achievement. In a 1996 study of two school districts in Tennessee, Sanders found that children assigned to three effective teachers in a row scored at the 83rd percentile in mathematics assessments at the end of 5th grade, while comparable children assigned to three ineffective teachers in a row scored only at the 29th percentile.

The Department continues to work with States and school districts to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified, up to date in their subject areas and effective, especially by encouraging school districts to make high-quality professional development available to their teachers so that they can continue to develop and expand on their knowledge and skills as their careers progress. High-quality professional development is a central and indispensable element of the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

larger effort to help all students achieve. Research indicates that such professional development can contribute to improvements in teachers' skills and practice and, thereby, raise student achievement.

The Department conducts monitoring visits to ensure that States are implementing the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program correctly and meeting the highly qualified teacher requirement. In 2006, the Department completed a 3-year cycle of monitoring visits to all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Information collected from these visits indicated that States made changes as a result of the highly qualified teacher requirements. These changes included amending their certification requirements, usually by requiring more content knowledge and having teacher candidates pass a written examination; establishing more alternative certification programs; requiring institutions of higher education to improve their teacher education programs so that more graduates will be highly qualified; requiring secondary-school teachers to have a major in the subjects they teach; allowing fewer emergency teaching certificates; encouraging dual certification, especially elementary certification with certification to teach special education or English as a second language; implementing incentive systems to attract and retain highly qualified teachers; and making teacher recertification requirements more focused on subject-matter knowledge. However, Department staff found that many LEAs have had difficulty ensuring that their special education and secondary mathematics and science teachers are highly qualified, primarily because the overall supply of those teachers is low. LEAs also reported difficulty ensuring that secondary teachers in rural areas and middle-school teachers meet the highly qualified teacher requirements.

After completing the first cycle of State reviews, the Department asked States to submit revised State plans for reaching the requirement of having all teachers highly qualified. Peer reviewers evaluated these plans, and the Department is using the information in the plans to inform the second round of monitoring, which began in the fall of 2007. In addition to determining whether States continue to make progress in ensuring that all teachers are highly qualified, reviewers are focusing on States' implementation of their plans for ensuring that poor and minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than other children, and on States' actions for holding their LEAs accountable for meeting the highly qualified teacher requirements. In general, Department staff are finding in the second round of monitoring that States have made progress in implementing the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program correctly, collecting more accurate highly qualified teacher data, and measuring and reporting progress on the implementation of their equitable distribution plans.

The Department continues to support the development of the knowledge base on teacher effectiveness and intends to reserve up to \$14.7 million (one-half of 1 percent) of the fiscal year 2010 appropriation primarily to continue evaluation studies (which are described under Other Performance Information in the Program Performance Information section below). Some evaluation funds may also be used to help disseminate and implement findings from evaluations.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Range of awards to States	\$13,987- 332,855	\$13,986- 327,274	\$14,049- 328,739
Average State grant	55,603	55,840	55,840
Amount for Outlying Areas	14,603	14,665	14,665
Amount for BIE	14,603	14,665	14,665
Evaluation	14,676	14,739	14,739

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established measures to assess the performance of the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program. These measures gauge the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high-poverty schools and by highly qualified teachers in elementary and secondary schools. These data were collected through ESEA's annual State performance reports for the years 2004 through 2006. The Department's EDFacts/Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) began collecting the data in 2007.

Goal: To improve teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the classroom and highly qualified principals and assistant principals in schools.

Objective: *Show an annual increase in the percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Measure: The percentage of core academic elementary classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	Baseline	90
2006	100	90
2007	100	94
2008	100	
2009	100	
2010	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic middle-school/high-school classes in high-poverty schools taught by highly qualified teachers.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	Baseline	84
2006	100	86
2007	100	89
2008	100	
2009	100	
2010	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	90	93
2006	95	94
2007	100	96
2008	100	
2009	100	
2010	100	

Measure: The percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	85	89
2006	92	91
2007	100	93
2008	100	
2009	100	
2010	100	

Source of data: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report and EDFacts/EDEN 2007.

Assessment of progress: The program made progress on this measure in 2007 but did not meet the targets. The 2008 data, reflecting the 2007-2008 school year, will be available in May 2009.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

In 2008, the Department developed the following two additional performance measures to reflect progress on ensuring an equitable distribution of teachers: (1) the number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in elementary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile; and (2) the number of States that reduce the difference between the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the highest-poverty quartile and the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in secondary schools in the lowest-poverty quartile. From 2005 to 2006, 20 States reduced the gap in elementary schools, and 22 States reduced the difference in secondary schools.

Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program focuses on decreasing the average number of days between the date of the monitoring visit and the date that the Department sends the monitoring report to the State.

Measure: The number of days it takes the Department of Education to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		83
2006	82	37
2007	81	Data not collected
2008	36	29.4
2009	35	
2010	34	

Assessment of progress: The Department did not conduct any monitoring visits in fiscal year 2007 because program staff were working with States on the revised State plans and preparing for the second round of monitoring visits. Beginning in 2008, data reflect the Department's second round of State monitoring.

Other Performance Information

The Department is currently using Improving Teacher Quality State Grants evaluation funds to conduct rigorous impact studies in four major areas: pre-service training, alternative routes to certification, professional development, and teacher retention strategies.

A study released in early 2009 of pre-service training identified different models of teacher training, including models of alternative certification, and compared the performance of students taught by teachers who have received different types of preparation. It found no empirical differences in performances on reading and math assessments of students taught by teachers trained through traditional routes versus teachers who had pursued alternative routes to certification. A second study will look at the effectiveness of teachers who chose to enter teaching through highly selective alternative certification programs; the report is expected in summer 2012.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

Two separate studies of teacher professional development activities are identifying and then testing promising approaches to in-service training. The first, which was completed in September 2008, examined the extent to which particular professional development activities change teaching practices in ways that research suggests are effective in improving student achievement in early reading. It found that although there were positive impacts on teachers' knowledge of scientifically based reading instruction, neither of the two professional development activities evaluated led to higher student test scores over a 1-year period, and any additional effect of coaching activities on teaching practices was also insignificant. The second study will examine professional development activities that focus on improving student achievement in mathematics. An interim report on the mathematics study is expected in fall 2009, and the final report is expected to be released in fall 2010.

Another evaluation will assess existing induction programs in order to identify promising teacher retention strategies. The first report, released in October 2008, found that participants in a comprehensive teacher induction activity had slightly higher retention rates than teachers in a control group, but these differences were not statistically significant. Two subsequent reports are expected to be released in fall 2009 and fall 2010.

Finally, a study of teacher incentives will evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of redistributing identified high-value-added teachers to targeted low-performing schools within a district. An interim report for this study is expected in fall 2012 and the final report in the fall 2013.

In addition to the impact studies described above, the Department has used program evaluation funds to assess the progress that States, school districts, and schools have made in implementing the teacher quality and professional development provisions in the ESEA. The report, which was released early in 2009, is based on the second round of data collection from the National Longitudinal Study of No Child Left Behind and the Study of State Implementation of Accountability and Teacher Quality Under No Child Left Behind. It presents findings from interviews with State education officials in all States and surveys of nationally representative samples of school district officials, principals, and teachers conducted in 2004-05 and 2006-07.

Key findings of the study include:

- By 2006-07, the vast majority of teachers met their States' requirements for being considered highly qualified under the ESEA. In that year, 94 percent of classes were taught by a highly qualified teacher. However, requirements for the demonstration of content-knowledge expertise varied greatly among States, both in the passing scores that new teachers must meet to demonstrate content knowledge on assessments and in the extent to which States give teachers credit for years of prior teaching experience in determining their highly qualified teacher status.
- In 2006-07, teachers considered highly qualified were more likely to be fully certified and to have a degree in the subject they were teaching, and had, on average, completed more college courses in their subject areas and more experience than teachers who were not highly qualified.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving teacher quality State grants

- The percentage of teachers who were not highly qualified was higher for special education teachers and middle-school teachers.
- Teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools were more likely to report that they were not highly qualified. Moreover, even among teachers who were considered highly qualified, teachers in high-poverty schools had less experience and were less likely to have a degree in the subject they taught.
- In 2006-07, 44 percent of school districts reported facing moderate or major challenges in attracting qualified applicants for teaching positions in mathematics, 53 percent for science, and 55 percent for special education. More than 90 percent of high-minority districts reported difficulty attracting applicants in science and mathematics who met the highly qualified teacher requirements.
- Although nearly all teachers reported taking part in content-focused professional development related to teaching reading or mathematics during the 2005-06 school year and summer, a relatively small proportion participated in such learning opportunities for an extended period of time, despite the ESEA's emphasis on sustained, intensive, classroom-focused professional development. For example, only 13 percent of elementary teachers participated for more than 24 hours in professional development that included in-depth study of topics in reading and only 6 percent received more than 24 hours of professional development that included in-depth study of topics in mathematics.

In general, the findings of this study indicate that States and school districts are working to implement and comply with the teacher qualification requirements in the statute. In addition, States have set standards for highly qualified teachers under the ESEA and have been updating their relevant data systems. Both States and districts are working to develop strategies designed to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, particularly in traditionally disadvantaged schools. However, the report notes several issues that warrant attention. First, variations among State policies regarding the content knowledge required to meet the highly qualified teacher requirements raise questions about whether some States have set high enough standards to ensure that teachers have a solid understanding of the subjects they teach. Second, the variation in the distribution of highly qualified teachers across types of teachers and schools highlights enduring inequities in student access to highly qualified teachers. Finally, the low percentage of teachers participating in content-focused professional development over an extended period of time suggests that more can be done to deepen teachers' content knowledge.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part B)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$178,978	\$178,978	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by promoting strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary school teachers, including by integrating teaching methods based on scientifically based research and technology into the curriculum. Grantees may also use program funds to develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local content standards; establish distance learning programs for mathematics and science teachers; and recruit individuals with mathematics, science, and engineering majors into the teaching profession through the use of signing and performance incentives, stipends, and scholarships. Professional development can include summer workshops, or institutes and programs, that bring mathematics and science teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers in order to expand teachers' subject-matter knowledge.

The Department awards 3-year grants directly to partnerships on a competitive basis when the appropriation for the program is less than \$100 million. If the appropriation reaches or exceeds \$100 million, as has been the case since fiscal year 2003, the Department provides grants to States by formula based on the number of children aged 5 to 17 who are from families with incomes below the poverty line; States then award the funds competitively to partnerships. Eligible partnerships must include the State educational agency (if the Department is awarding the grants directly to partnerships); an engineering, mathematics, or science department of an institution of higher education (IHE); and a high-need local educational agency (LEA). In addition, partnerships may include another engineering, mathematics, science, or teacher training department of an IHE; additional LEAs, public charter schools, public or private elementary or secondary schools; a business; or a nonprofit or for-profit organization of demonstrated effectiveness in improving the quality of mathematics and science teachers.

This is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which the funds are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$178,560
2006.....	182,160
2007.....	182,160
2008.....	178,978
2009.....	178,978

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration is requesting approximately \$179 million for the Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) program, the same amount as the 2009 level. At the requested level, funded partnerships will continue actions to improve students' mathematics and science achievement.

Improving American students' achievement in mathematics and science is vital to ensuring the economic wellbeing of our country. For the United States to remain competitive in the global economy, build and maintain a highly skilled workforce, and nourish technological innovation, we must improve mathematics and science teaching and learning. Projections from the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) indicate that over 80 percent of the fastest-growing occupations are dependent on knowledge of mathematics and science. BLS projections, released in 2005, on the 10 fastest-growing occupations between 2004 and 2014 indicate that the health care and computer fields (both of which require a strong background in mathematics and science) will experience the most growth in the coming years.

However, national assessments suggest that American students need to improve their performance in mathematics and science if we are to remain competitive in the global economy. For example, in the 2004 National Assessment of Educational Progress, the percentage of 17-year-olds who successfully performed moderately complex mathematical procedures and reasoning showed no measurable change from 1999 and 2004; also, no change was found in the percentage of students who demonstrated the highest performance level. On the 2005 mathematics assessment, 39 percent of 12th-grade students performed below the basic level and 77 percent performed below the proficient level in mathematics. Furthermore, on the 2005 science assessment, only the results for 4th-grade students improved from earlier assessments; scores for 8th-grade students remained flat and scores for 12th-grade students remained flat compared to the 2000 assessment and declined compared to the 1996 assessment.

Students from many other advanced countries have continued to outperform American students on international assessments. For example, the 2006 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) focused on the performance of 15-year-olds in mathematics literacy and problem solving. Results of that study suggest that American high-school students continue to lag behind students elsewhere in mathematics and science. On the PISA mathematics assessment, the United States ranked 24th out of 30 countries belonging to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which represents the world's most advanced countries, and 17th out of 30 on the science assessment.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

A 2007 report from the Department's National Center for Education Statistics, *Advanced Mathematics and Science Course-taking in the Spring High School Senior Classes of 1982, 1992, and 2004*, indicates that high school graduates' completion of mathematics and science courses increased between 1982 and 2004 and that greater percentages of graduates had taken advanced mathematics and science courses in 2004 compared to 1982. However, graduates in the highest socioeconomic status (SES) quartile were consistently more likely than graduates in the lowest SES quartile to have completed advanced-level coursework in mathematics. Moreover, the gap between these quartiles grew between 1982 and 2004; the gap was 18 percentage points in 1982 but 35 percentage points in 2004. In science, graduates in the highest SES quartile also consistently completed the most advanced level of science courses at higher rates than their peers in the other three cohorts.

In a 2005 study entitled, *Highly Qualified to Do What? The Relationship Between NCLB Teacher Quality Mandates and the Use of Reform-Oriented Instruction in Middle School Mathematics*, Thomas Smith and colleagues found that teacher participation in content-related professional development is positively associated with increased use of conceptual teaching strategies that are more effective than teaching strategies that merely emphasize memorization and computation skills. The authors also note that teachers at the lowest level of mathematics content knowledge are usually the least likely to participate in high-quality professional development activities. Providing teachers with content-related professional development has the potential to increase teachers' emphasis on conceptual instruction and help close the gap in teaching skills between teachers with and without degrees in mathematics.

Mathematics and Science Partnerships helps to address these concerns by focusing on teaching and learning in mathematics and science that is based on scientifically based research. Funding will continue to allow partnerships to offer professional development and curricula that will help prepare American students to compete in the global, high-tech economy.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount distributed to States	\$178,083	\$178,083	\$178,083
Range of State formula grants	\$890-21,906	\$890-20,038	\$890-20,038
Average State formula grant	\$3,180	\$3,180	\$3,180
Evaluation	\$895	\$895	\$895

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To improve the quality of mathematics and science teachers and increase both the number of highly qualified mathematics and science teachers and the achievement of students participating in Mathematics and Science Partnerships programs.

Objective: *Demonstrate the effectiveness of professional development activities for Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers through increased achievement on assessments of mathematics and science content knowledge.*

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who significantly increase their content knowledge, as reflected on project-level pre-and post-assessments.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	78
2008	79	
2009	80	
2010	81	

Objective: *Increase the percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics and science.*

Measure: The percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the basic level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	60
2008	61	
2009	62	
2010	63	

Measure: The percentage of students in classrooms of Mathematics and Science Partnerships teachers who score at the proficient level or above in State assessments of mathematics or science.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	44
2008	45	
2009	46	
2010	47	

Objective: *Evaluate activities that measure the percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations that are conducted successfully and that yield scientifically valid results.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that report using an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	37
2008	38	
2009	39	
2010	40	

Measure: The percentage of Mathematics and Science Partnerships projects that use an experimental or quasi-experimental design for their evaluations, that are conducted successfully, and that yield scientifically valid results on grantees' final reports.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	Baseline	12
2008	13	
2009	14	
2010	15	

Assessment of progress: The 2008 data will be available in the fall of 2009 for the first measure and in the summer of 2009 for the four other measures.

Efficiency Measure

The efficiency measure for Mathematics and Science Partnerships focuses on increasing the percentage of State educational agencies that submit complete and accurate data for the program's performance measures in a timely manner.

Measure: The percentage of State educational agencies that submit complete and accurate data on program performance measures in a timely manner.

Year	Target	Actual
2006	Baseline	94
2007	100	100
2008	100	
2009	100	
2010	100	

Assessment of progress: 2008 data should be available in the summer of 2009.

Other Performance Information

The Department is using evaluation funds to collect and analyze annually descriptive data from partnerships supported by the program. Partnerships also provide a narrative description of their activities annually; these narratives contain information about teacher participation, growth in teacher content knowledge, and student learning.

The Department hired a contractor to aggregate data supplied by partnerships. The contractor and Department staff work closely with States and partnerships to help ensure that the data are consistent across States and projects. A particular challenge is aggregating data from projects

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and science partnerships

that vary widely in terms of the length of the professional development provided, the number of teachers served, the grade levels taught by the teachers served, and whether the projects focus on mathematics, science, or a combination of the two.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title II, Part D, Subparts 1 and 2)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$269,872	\$100,000	-\$169,872
Recovery Act appropriation	650,000	0	-650,000

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

The Educational Technology State Grants program supports State, district, and school efforts to integrate technology into curricula in order to improve teaching and learning. Local educational agencies (LEAs) use their funds for: (1) professional development to promote the integration of technology into curricula and instruction; (2) public-private partnerships to increase students' and teachers' access to technology; (3) distance learning strategies that deliver academic courses and curricula to areas that otherwise would not have access to those courses and curricula; (4) purchasing effective curricula that use technology; (5) efforts to use technology to improve communication with parents; (6) the preparation of teachers to serve as technology experts in their schools; (7) acquiring and maintaining hardware, software, and connectivity linkages; (8) developing and implementing information technology courses; and (9) using technology to collect, manage, and analyze data. Unless an LEA can demonstrate to the satisfaction of its State educational agency (SEA) that it already provides high-quality professional development on the integration of technology into curricula, it must use at least 25 percent of any formula allocation it receives for that professional development.

Of the total appropriation, the Department first reserves: (1) three-quarters of 1 percent for schools supported by the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education; (2) one-half of 1 percent for grants to the Outlying Areas; and (3) up to 2 percent for national activities. The remaining funds are allocated to States in proportion to each State's share of funds received that year under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), except that no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the amount available for all States.

Each SEA must distribute at least 95 percent of its allocation to LEAs. Under the authorizing statute, the SEA uses 50 percent of the amount available to make competitive grants to high-need LEAs (defined as an LEA that (1) has among the highest rates of poverty in the State and (2) operates at least one school identified for improvement under Title I or has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology) or to partnerships that include at least one high-need LEA and at least one other entity with expertise in integrating technology effectively into curricula. In making competitive awards, an SEA must give priority to applications from LEAs that receive formula allocations too small to carry out the purposes of the program effectively and must ensure that all awards are of sufficient size and duration to support the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

purposes of the program effectively. The SEAs distribute the remaining 50 percent to LEAs through a formula based on each LEA's share of funds under ESEA Title I, Part A. An SEA may also reserve up to 5 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting the competition, and for State-level activities such as providing technical assistance to grantees and establishing or supporting public-private partnerships to acquire educational technology for high-need LEAs.

In fiscal year 2006 appropriations act, Congress included language allowing States to award up to 100 percent of funds competitively. The Congress has continued to provide this flexibility each year (including in fiscal year 2009, for the monies appropriated under the fiscal year 2009 Omnibus Appropriations Act) and it applies to the \$650 million provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 as well.

To receive funding, each State is required by statute to develop a statewide, long-range educational technology plan. Each plan is required to include descriptions of, among other things: (1) the SEA's goals for using advanced technology to improve student academic achievement; (2) how the SEA will take steps to ensure that all teachers and students in the State have increased access to technology; and (3) the State's strategies for using technology to increase parental involvement.

In addition, the Department may reserve up to 2 percent of the amount appropriated for the program for national activities. The Department has used these funds to conduct a required study on the conditions and practices under which educational technology: (1) is effective in improving student achievement; and (2) increases the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction. The Department also has supported a range activities, from research to workshops, to assist States with (1) improving the quality of technology-related teacher preparation and professional development programs; (2) examining data use and data systems issues, including the development of interoperability and technical standards; and (3) evaluating the impact of online learning and virtual schooling on student achievement.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided an additional \$650 million for Educational Technology, with 100 percent of the money allocated to the States by formula. Under ARRA, SEAs may use funds for any purpose consistent with the program's statutory and regulatory requirements, the Administration is encouraging grantees to focus on short-term investments with the potential for long-term benefits. The funds are available for obligation until September 30, 2011.

The Administration's overall guidance for use of ARRA funds includes four key principles: (1) spend funds quickly to save and create jobs; (2) improve student achievement through school improvement and reform; (3) ensure transparency, reporting, and accountability; and (4) invest one-time ARRA funds using evidence-based practices wisely and thoughtfully so as to minimize any "funding cliff" when they are no longer available.

The Department will issue program-specific guidance to provide information on the allocation, use, and reporting of Educational Technology ARRA funds.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

The program is forward funded. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year. The Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided \$650 million in additional funding for Educational Technology, with 100 percent of the money allocated to the States by formula. These funds are available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 2010.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$496,000
2006.....	272,250
2007.....	272,250
2008.....	267,494
2009.....	269,872
Recovery Act	650,000

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$100 million for the Educational Technology State Grants program for 2010, a decrease of \$169.9 million from the 2009 regular appropriation level. The Administration proposes this decrease because it is anticipated that States will have significant funds remaining from the Recovery Act allocations. These funds are available for use through the 2010-2011 school year. The Educational Technology State Grants program funds help to provide districts and schools with the tools and resources necessary to challenge students to achieve academically and prepare them to compete in the global economy.

The technology landscape in schools has shifted dramatically over the past decade. Today, nearly all schools have computers with Internet access, and most instructional computers have high-speed Internet connections, as compared to 1994 when only two-thirds had Internet connections of any kind. However, the presence of computers in schools does not necessarily indicate that all students have equal access to them or that the technologies are being used effectively in classrooms.

Technology Counts 2008, the most recent annual report from Education Week that grades States on their leadership in technology policy and practice, gave the Nation a grade of “C plus” overall and noted that States varied considerably, with a majority residing in the “C” range. Data from the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show that student access differs by grade and by region of the country. On average, 95 percent of fourth-graders have computer access, with only minimal variation among States. By contrast, NAEP data show that only 83 percent of eighth-graders have computer access, with significant variation among States. For example, eighth-grade computer access was the highest in Maine at 100 percent and the lowest in the District of Columbia at 61 percent. Another measure of access is the ratio of students per instructional computer with Internet access in public schools. The most recent data show that the ratio is approximately 4 students per computer, a decrease from the 12 students per computer in 1998.

Technology Counts 2008 also found that a majority of States have policies related to technology use and technology standards for students and teachers. Yet, only 5 States assess student competency on those standards and approximately 19 States connect teacher certification with technology

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

coursework or competence. The use of computerized assessments and online coursetaking has also increased with approximately 10 States using computerized assessments to test all students and at least 25 States with online coursetaking or some form of virtual schools. Despite progress in some States to improve student access to technology, many districts, especially those that serve high concentrations of low-income students, continue to have difficulty providing teachers with the technologies and training resources necessary to fully and effectively integrate technology and data into classroom instruction.

The Educational Technology State Grants authority and the Administration's budget request would support States, districts, and schools in their efforts to integrate technology effectively into classrooms with the goal of improving student academic achievement. The budget request would continue the policy of permitting States to use up to 100 percent of their allocations for competitive grants to LEAs; at the level of funding proposed, States would likely find it prudent to make competitive awards in an amount likely to have a significant impact on teaching and learning, rather than make many small subgrants.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount for State grants	\$258,867	\$903,044	\$96,775
Range of awards	\$1,294-30,565	\$4,515-99,351	\$484-10,605
Amount for BIE	\$1,966	\$6,859	\$735
Amount for Outlying Areas	\$1,311	\$4,572	\$490
National activities set-aside	\$5,350	\$5,397	\$2,000

Note: The fiscal year 2009 figures include the \$650,000 thousand provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). States will be required to report on ARRA funds and funds from the fiscal year 2009 regular appropriation separately.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in fiscal year 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

The primary goal of the Educational Technology State Grants program is to improve the academic achievement of students, particularly students who attend high-poverty or low-performing schools, through the use of technology in schools. The Department established several performance measures to assess the extent to which LEAs receiving substantial amounts of program funds are able to demonstrate that: (1) they have fully and effectively integrated technology into curriculum; (2) teachers have met State technology standards; and (3) students have met their State's technology literacy standards by the eighth grade. The Department is collecting data for these measures through ED*Facts* data collections, grantee performance reports, and the National Educational Technology Trends Study (NETTS) surveys. The Department expects to assess the quality and availability of these data this spring to determine the feasibility of establishing baseline and annual performance targets.

Goal: To facilitate the comprehensive and integrated use of educational technology in instruction and curricula to improve teaching and student achievement.

Objective: To help ensure that students and teachers in high-poverty, high-need schools have access to educational technology comparable to that of students and teachers in other schools.

Measure: The percentage point difference in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	0	5
2006	0	
2007	0	
2008	0	
2009	0	
2010	0	

Assessment of Progress: Low-poverty schools are defined as schools with less than 35 percent of their students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches, while high-poverty schools are defined as schools with 75 percent or more of their students eligible. The target for this measure is to have no difference in Internet access between high- and low-poverty schools. Data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) are shown above for 2005. The Department discontinued the NCES Internet access surveys, with the last survey released in 2006, and plans to collect data for this measure using ED*Facts*. Data submitted by States for school year 2006-07 were too incomplete to report. States have until the end of fiscal year 2009 to comply with the Department's mandatory data submission through ED*Facts*. The Department expects to have additional performance data available in fall 2009.

The NETTS report provides some additional information on this measure. For school years 2004-05 and 2006-07, there were no statistically significant differences in Internet access between classrooms in high- and low-poverty schools. Further, for school year 2006-07, 72 percent of teachers in elementary grades, 55 percent in middle school grades, and 49 percent in high school grades reported that students had high-speed Internet access within their classrooms. Differences in school location (rural, suburban, and urban) also were not significant predictors of classroom Internet access.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

Efficiency Measure

The Department developed an efficiency measure to assess the timeliness of the Department's monitoring process, specifically the percentage of monitoring reports that the Department sends within 45 days after a monitoring visit (both on-site and virtual). The data for fiscal years 2007 and 2008 show that the Department did not issue any monitoring reports within 45 days of an Educational Technology State grant monitoring visit.

The Department has taken steps to initiate a new monitoring protocol that integrates information from five formula grant programs administered by the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education into a comprehensive monitoring report. Since the Department began to implement this new monitoring protocol in fiscal year 2007, the Educational Technology State grant program has made some improvement in the average amount of time it takes to issue a monitoring report, from 258 days in fiscal year 2006 to 56 days in fiscal year 2007 but then up to 90 days in 2008, which is more than double the efficiency goal of 45 days. The Department established a performance target of 75 percent for 2009 and expects to have additional efficiency data available in fall 2009.

Other Performance Information

To assess the implementation of the Educational Technology State Grants program and the extent to which States and districts have created conditions for schools and teachers to use technology effectively in improving teaching and learning, the Department is conducting a multiyear national evaluation, the National Educational Technology Trends Study. NETTS is addressing three primary research areas: (1) student and teacher access to technology; (2) teacher preparedness to use technology effectively in their classrooms; and (3) effective integration of technology into curriculum and instruction. The study is also examining the differences in State strategies for the use of program funds, the types of activities supported, and the various approaches that States use to address the needs of low-income children.

In 2007, the Department released a 2-volume report from the study, *National Educational Technology Trends Study: State Strategies and Practices*, which documents State educational technology policies and programs, including the role of the Educational Technology State Grants program in State efforts. The study examined survey and case study data to document State priorities for educational technology, perceptions of State and district administrators on technology-related needs, and challenges in the administration of the Educational Technology State Grants program during its first 2 years of operation. The report noted that, by 2004, 42 States had student technology standards, with 18 States having "stand-alone" standards, 16 States having technology standards embedded within other academic content standards, and the remaining 8 States having both stand-alone technology standards and embedded standards.

The report also found that a majority of States had not met the second goal of the program, which is to assist students in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade. Only 18 States had included student technology literacy as a specific priority for their Educational Technology State Grants and approximately 13 States had required applicants to focus specifically on student technology literacy in their competitive grant applications. Further, only

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

two States reported using Statewide assessments of students' proficiency with technology and more than one-third of States reported that they were undecided as to whether, or how, they would assess students' technology literacy in future years. In the area of teachers' use of technology, a majority of States reported having at least minimum standards for teachers' use of technology; yet, few were formally assessing teachers' technology skills at the State level.

In terms of effective integration of technology in classrooms, the Department's 2009 report, *Implementing Data-Informed Decision Making in Schools: Teacher Access, Supports and Use*, which used survey data collected through NETTS, noted an increase in the percentage of teachers who reported using technology to develop curricula or assignments from 31 percent in school year 2004-2005 to 47 percent in school year 2006-2007. The report also found that teacher access to student data systems increased significantly from 48 percent in 2005 to 74 percent in 2007. Yet, even with this increase in access, the systems often lacked the types of data that teachers need to make informed and relevant instructional decisions. Among teachers who had access to a student data system, they reported that the data most frequently available to them were student attendance data (74 percent) and grades (67 percent). Only 55 percent of these teachers reported having access to their current students' performance on benchmark or diagnostic assessments.

The NETTS data collection examined district- and school-level data and also conducted a second State survey on (1) how the Educational Technology State Grants program works in coordination with other Federal and State educational technology programs, and (2) State programmatic activities, such as professional development, technology integration, and evaluation. Findings from this phase of the data collection and the second survey, along with trend data and analysis of implementation strategies at the State, district, and school levels, will be included in the final NETTS evaluation report, which is expected to be released in spring 2009.

Since the NETTS evaluation focused solely on program implementation, it is also important to look at other research that has assessed the impacts of technology on student learning and academic achievement. In 2009, the Department released *The National Study of the Effectiveness of Educational Technology Interventions* final report, a 2-year congressionally mandated study, which examined the effectiveness of educational technology and its impact on student achievement. The study found no significant difference in student achievement between the classrooms that used computer based reading and mathematics products and those classrooms that did not, in either the first or second year of use by teachers. In addition, only 1 of the 10 products tested had a statistically significant on increasing student achievement in 4th grade reading. A copy of the final report is available on the Department's website (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094041/pdf/20094042.pdf>).

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program.

- *Collect data on annual, long-term performance measures and use these data to establish baselines and performance targets.* The Department established several annual, long-term, and efficiency measures to determine the impact of the program on

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational technology State grants

student achievement and classroom practices. Performance data are collected from the States through *EDFacts*. The submission of *EDFacts* data was mandatory for the first time for school year 2006-2007, but States have until the end of fiscal year 2009 to submit final data for that school year. In late 2008, the Department assessed the quality and availability of performance data for school years 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 and determined that those data were too incomplete to establish baselines and annual performance targets. The Department expects to have data available by the fall of 2009 and will use these data to establish annual performance targets.

- *Work with States to ensure that the program's purpose and goals are understood and data reporting is accurate.* The Department continues to work closely with States through desk and virtual monitoring site visits and technical assistance calls to ensure that program management expectations and goals are clear and that the program, financial, and performance information reported by States is accurate and current. The Department is drafting guidance, specifically tailored to State-level program staff, on reporting program requirements through *EDFacts*. To further support State efforts, the Department also is planning three national meetings with State Technology Directors and *EdFacts* coordinators to discuss strategies for improving the quality and timeliness of the performance data.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IV, Part B)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$1,131,166	\$1,131,166	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program enables communities to establish or expand centers that provide extended student learning opportunities, such as before- and after-school programs, and provide related services to their families. Centers must target their services primarily to students who attend schools eligible to operate a schoolwide program under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) (which are schools with at least a 40 percent child poverty rate) or other schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families. In addition to extended learning opportunities, program funds may also be used to provide art and music education activities, recreational activities, telecommunications and technology education programs, expanded library service hours, parental involvement and family literacy programs, and drug and violence prevention activities.

Program funds are allocated by formula to States. Of the total appropriation, the Department reserves: (1) up to 1 percent to carry out national activities; and (2) up to 1 percent for grants to the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and to the Outlying Areas. The Department allocates the remaining funds to States in proportion to each State's share of funds in the previous fiscal year under Part A of Title I. However, no State may receive less than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount available for States.

Each State educational agency (SEA) must award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies (LEAs), community-based organizations, faith-based organizations, or other public or private entities that can demonstrate experience, or the promise of success, in providing educational and related activities. In making awards, States give priority to applications that: (1) propose to target services to students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I; and (2) are submitted jointly by at least one LEA that receives funds under Part A of Title I and at least one community-based organization or other public or private entity. States must make awards of at least \$50,000 per year and for a period of 3 to 5 years.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

An SEA may reserve up to 2 percent of its allocation for administrative expenses, including the costs of conducting its grants competition. In addition, an SEA may reserve up to 3 percent of its allocation for: (1) monitoring of programs; (2) providing technical assistance and training; and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of the program.

This program is forward funded. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$991,077
2006.....	981,166
2007.....	981,166
2008.....	1,081,166
2009.....	1,131,166

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$1.1 billion for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, the same level as the 2009 appropriation. Funds in 2010 will support an estimated 10,140 centers in communities across the Nation, which will provide children, particularly those who attend schools that have been identified as in need of improvement under Title I, with after-school care and enrichment that reinforce classroom learning. In addition, centers may provide other services, programs, and activities that complement students' regular academic studies, such as art, music, and recreation. Programs may also offer families of students served with educational opportunities. At the requested level, the program would serve an estimated 1.6 million children and 250,000 adults. Of the participants who are children, an estimated 870,000 will attend for 30 days or more.

The evaluation of the 21st CCLC program as it operated prior to the No Child Left Behind Act is an important part of the program's history. The report revealed weaknesses in program implementation and outcomes, and informed program improvement efforts at the Federal, State, and local levels. In addition, the evaluation fostered a reinvigorated discussion in the field regarding the possibilities for after-school outcomes. An emerging field of research shows that high-quality after-school programs can have a positive impact on desirable student outcomes, such as higher attendance during the regular school day, more frequent positive social behaviors, and less frequent problem behaviors, and can increase student academic achievement.

At the request level, the Department would reserve a total of up to \$11.3 million for national technical assistance and evaluation activities. These activities will focus on the identification of practices that may lead to successful academic outcomes in the after-school setting and on the collection and reporting of quality program performance data. Specific activities currently being supported with these funds include: an annual Summer Institute that provides technical assistance and professional development for State 21st CCLC directors and local subgrantees; data collection

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

and analysis efforts through the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System (PPICS), which will inform program monitoring and provide information about the program to the public; and an evaluation to identify promising practices among programs that attract and retain high school participants and help those students to improve their academic achievement.

The Administration will look to the reauthorization process as a vehicle for ensuring that this program supports effective extended-learning-time opportunities, one of the Administration's education priorities.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>21st Century Community Learning Centers</u>			
Amount distributed to States	\$1,059,542	\$1,108,542	\$1,108,542
Average State award	\$20,376	\$21,318	\$21,318
Range of State awards	\$5,298-132,000	\$5,543-130,890	\$5,543-121,946
Reservation for State activities and administration	\$52,977	\$55,427	\$55,427
National activities and evaluation	\$10,812	\$11,312	\$11,312
Amount for Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas	\$10,812	\$11,312	\$11,312
Number of centers supported	9,691 ¹	10,140 ¹	10,140 ¹
Total students served	1,550,990 ¹	1,622,720 ¹	1,622,720 ¹
Students attending 30 days or more	831,430	869,880	869,880
Total adults served	247,930	259,390	259,390

¹ These estimates are based on the actual number of centers supported and students served with FY 2007 funds as reported in 2008, which are the most recent data available.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To establish community learning centers that help students in high-poverty, low-performing schools meet academic achievement standards that offer a broad array of additional services designed to complement the regular academic program and that offer families of students opportunities for educational development.

Objective: Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose mathematics grades improve from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math	Elementary Math	Middle or High School Math	Total Math
2005	45.0	45.0	45.0	39.65	36.78	38.82
2006	46.0	46.0	46.0	42.45	42.65	42.18
2007	47.0	47.0	47.0	41.76	39.18	41.35
2008	47.5	47.5	47.5			
2009	48.0	48.0	48.0			
2010	48.5	48.5	48.5			

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants whose English grades improve from fall to spring.

Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English	Elementary English	Middle or High School English	Total English
2005	45.0	45.0	45.0	42.18	39.79	41.47
2006	46.0	46.0	46.0	42.48	41.07	42.52
2007	47.0	47.0	47.0	44.18	40.27	43.19
2008	47.5	47.5	47.5			
2009	48.0	48.0	48.0			
2010	48.5	48.5	48.5			

Assessment of progress: A regular participant is defined as a student who attends the program for 30 days or more during the course of the school year. To report data by grade span for this measure, the data system sorts program performance data by analyzing participant demographic information at the center level (as opposed to the individual student level). For this reason, programs that serve youth of all ages are not included in the columns disaggregated by participant age. The methodology used to report for this measure, therefore, partially explains why the 2006 figures for "Total English" are higher than those figures

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

disaggregated by grade level. According to data States submitted through the PPICS, the program made some progress toward the 2007 targets of 47 percent for elementary school participants in English, but performance decreased in elementary school math and in both subjects for middle or high school students. For both groups and for participants as a whole, the program did not meet the targets.

Measure: The percentage of regular program participants who improve from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments.				
Year	Target		Actual	
	Elementary Reading	Middle or High School Math	Elementary Reading	Middle or High School Math
2005			30.72	27.20
2006			20.63	12.95
2007	24	14	22.42	17.17
2008	24	16		
2009	26	16		
2010	35	20		

Assessment of progress: The Department calculates data for this measure by dividing the number of regular participants who scored proficient or better in spring of the reporting year (but were not proficient in the previous year) by the total number of current-year regular participants who scored below proficient the previous spring. For a regular participant to be included in the data for this measure, the center has to have data on the student's prior-year and current-year State assessment results. In 2007, 22.42 percent of regular elementary school-aged participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in reading, while 17.7 percent of regular participants who were in middle or high school improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in math. These data represent 43,573 regular elementary school-aged attendees, and 34,220 middle- and high-school-aged attendees. Targets for 2007 through 2010 were set based on actual performance in 2005 and 2006. The program made progress but did not meet the 2007 target of 24 percent for elementary school participants. However, the program did meet the target of 14 percent for middle or high school students.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

Measure: The percentage of students with teacher-reported improvements in student behavior.						
Year	Target			Actual		
	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall	Elementary	Middle or High School	Overall
2005				71.48	68.05	71.08
2006	67	67	67	68.12	66.98	67.94
2007	75	75	75	68.16	68.80	70.72
2008	75	75	75			
2009	75	75	75			
2010	75	75	75			

Assessment of progress: According to data that grantees submitted to the 21st CCLC Profile and Performance Information Collection System, the program made progress on this measure in 2007 but did not meet the targets.

Efficiency Measures

The Department developed 3 new operational efficiency measures for the 21st Century program. The baseline for the first measure, the percentage of SEAs that submit complete data on 21st Century program performance measures by the deadline, was set at 80 percent in 2008. The second measure, the average number of days it takes the Department to submit a final monitoring report to an SEA after the conclusion of a site visit, established a baseline of 45 days in 2008. The third measure, the average number of weeks a State takes to resolve compliance findings in a monitoring visit report, will have baseline data in September 2009.

Other Performance Information

The 21st CCLC program focuses on promoting students' academic achievement. In 2003, the Department's Institute of Education Sciences began a rigorous impact evaluation of the new program, supported by national activities funds. This study: (1) developed two after-school interventions (one each in math and reading) that are based on sound theory or that have scientific evidence in a related area; and (2) will rigorously test their effectiveness through experimental studies. The first report for this study was released in June 2008. The evaluation found a statistically significant difference in student achievement between students in the math after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities. In study sites implementing the reading program, there was no statistically significant difference in reading achievement between students in the reading after-school program and those in the regular after-school activities. It is important to note that the sample of centers is not nationally representative and that findings from this study cannot, therefore, be generalized to the 21st CCLC program. The final report is expected to be released in summer 2009.

In addition, the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service is analyzing data from a nationally representative sample of 21st CCLC programs to evaluate State and local program implementation. This study focuses on how, and to what extent, funds support high-quality programs that emphasize academic content. The study also examines staffing patterns and

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century community learning centers

other features of after-school program implementation that may have an impact on the quality of the programming offered. The report from this evaluation will be available later in 2009.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Hold States accountable for meeting program performance goals.* The Department, through a contract, has developed a Web-based reporting instrument for monitoring grantee and sub-grantee performance. Generally, during the site visits to monitor programs, the Department's technical assistance has focused on developing strategies to design and sustain academic enrichment activities and services, evaluating student achievement, and measuring program progress. As a result of the site visits and monitoring calls, States have implemented changes to their processes and infrastructure in order to focus on these areas. In addition, in spring 2009, the Department will release a report that will include staffing and program information and data that will be used to inform program improvement. The report will include data in chart and graph format that can be used by the Department, States, and sub-grantees for training and professional development purposes.
- *Support research on after-school models that effectively improve student achievement.* The Department, through a contract, is identifying and evaluating after-school programs that have higher-than-average participation among high school students. The Department will release initial findings of this effort this spring. In addition, the Institute for Education Sciences released a report on the impact of specific programs in the after-school setting. It can be viewed at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20084021.asp>.
- *Develop a meaningful efficiency measure for the program, collect performance information, and set performance targets for the measure.* The Department has selected 3 efficiency measures and set the baselines for two of the measures in 2008. The baseline for the third measure will be set in 2009.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 6)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$7,463	0	-\$7,463

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. The Administration is not proposing appropriations language for FY 2010 nor seeking reauthorizing legislation.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program supports research, demonstration projects, and other activities designed to build and enhance the ability of elementary and secondary schools to meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students. The Department awards competitive grants to State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), institutions of higher education, and other public and private agencies and organizations.

Grants are awarded under two priorities: (1) research and development and (2) SEA/LEA capacity building. Five-year research and development grants support initiatives to develop and improve model programs serving students who are underrepresented in gifted and talented education. At least half of the applications approved for funding each year must address the priority of serving populations of students who may not be identified as gifted and talented through traditional assessment methods. Three-year SEA and LEA capacity-building grants support State and local efforts to improve services for gifted and talented students. The program statute mandates that funds appropriated in excess of \$7.5 million, the fiscal year 2001 level, be competitively awarded to State educational agencies or one or more local educational agencies to improve services and develop their capacity to serve gifted and talented students more effectively.

The program also supports the National Research Center for the Education of Gifted and Talented Children and Youth. Not more than 30 percent of program funds may be used to support the Center.

The 2008 competition helped sharpen the program's focus by funding projects that will scale up and evaluate models designed to increase the number of gifted and talented students from underrepresented groups who, through gifted and talented education programs, perform at high levels of academic achievement. Applicants were required to provide: (1) evidence from one or more scientifically based research and evaluation studies indicating that the proposed model raised the achievement of gifted and talented students from one or more underrepresented groups in one or more core subject areas; (2) evidence from one or more scientifically based

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

research and evaluation studies that the proposed model resulted in the identification of and provision of services to increased numbers of gifted and talented students from underrepresented groups who participate in gifted and talented programs; (3) evidence that the applicant has expertise within its leadership team in gifted and talented education, research and program evaluation, content knowledge in one or more core academic subject areas, and working with underrepresented groups; (4) a sound plan for implementing the model in multiple settings or with multiple populations; and, (5) a research and evaluation plan that employs an experimental or quasi-experimental design to measure the impact of the model on the achievement of students from underrepresented groups, including students who are economically disadvantaged or limited English proficient, or who have disabilities, and on the number of these students who are identified as gifted and talented and served through gifted and talented programs. Seven projects from this competition were first funded in 2008, and approximately 8 additional projects will be funded for the first time in fiscal year 2009.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$11,022
2006.....	9,596
2007.....	7,596
2008	7,463
2009	7,463

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests no funding for the Javits Gifted and Talented Student Education program. The Administration believes that gifted and talented education will continue to be supported in the States without additional funding from a small Federal program that is unlikely to make a major impact on the field or on education more generally.

While the projects that have been funded by this program might have been effective in meeting the needs of some gifted and talented students, there is little evidence that, by annually funding a handful of projects, the Javits program has been effective in advancing gifted and talented education nationally, identifying the most effective practices in gifted and talented education, or bringing about improvements in the field.

Most gifted and talented education programs in the United States are carried out without Federal support. According to the National Association of Gifted Children, at least 39 States reported funding gifted and talented education activities in 2004-05. Support for these programs varies widely by State; while 14 states budgeted less than \$500,000 apiece on gifted and talented education, 12 of the States surveyed each spent over \$10 million on similar activities.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Research and demonstration activities			
Funding for new awards	\$2,647	\$3,015	0
Number of new awards	7	8	0
Average new award	\$378	\$377	0
Funding for continuation awards	\$3,002	\$2,708	0
Number of continuation awards	6	7	0
Average continuation award	\$500	\$387	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$73	0	0
Research and development center	\$1,741	\$1,740	0

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department established three measures to assess the impact of the program. These measures focus on the quality of project designs, professional development, and significant academic achievement in targeted student populations. The Department collects data for these measures every 2 years by convening an expert panel of scientists and practitioners to review information from a sample of annual performance reports and self-evaluations prepared by grantees. Baselines for these measures were set in 2005 and 2006.

Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personal training, and other activities of national significance.

Objective: *Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, are limited English proficient, and/or have disabilities.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

Measure: The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs for effective professional development focusing on gifted and talented education with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		90
2006	91	
2007	92	100
2008	93	
2009	93	

Assessment of Progress: In 2005, the baseline year, 9 of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for effective designs for professional development focusing on gifted and talented education. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 92 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Javits Gifted and Talented Education program in fiscal year 2010, so no target for that year is shown.

Measure: The percentage of new evidence-based Javits Gifted and Talented Education project designs with average reviewer ratings for quality of high and above.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		70
2006	71	
2007	72	100
2008	73	
2009	73	

Assessment of Progress: In 2005, the baseline year, 7 of the 10 sampled projects received ratings of high or above for quality of evidence-based project designs. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects received such a rating, exceeding the target of 72 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the Javits program in fiscal year 2010, so no target for that year is shown.

Measure: The percentage of Javits Gifted and Talented Education projects with significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		90
2007	91	100
2008	92	
2009	93	

Assessment of Progress: In 2006, the baseline year for this measure, 9 of the 10 sampled projects showed significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations. Although the expert panel determined that these projects showed significant gains in student academic achievement, it noted, among other things, that the program needed better empirical

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Javits gifted and talented education

measures for judging how high-ability students improve and that most project evaluations were not structured to compare achievement results with a control group. The panel suggested that program staff work with the projects on developing and reporting valid and reliable student achievement data that would help measure the impact of specialized gifted and talented curricula on student learning. In response, the Department conducted site visits and additional monitoring to identify projects in need of technical assistance and is working with projects to ensure the collection of reliable achievement data in accordance with original grant proposals. In 2007, each of the five sampled projects demonstrated significant gains in academic achievement among target student populations, exceeding the target of 91 percent. The Administration is not requesting funding for the program in fiscal year 2010, so no target for that year is shown.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part D, Subpart 9)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$26,328	\$26,328	0

¹ The program was authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Foreign Language Assistance program (FLAP) supports competitive grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and State educational agencies (SEAs) to increase the quality and quantity of foreign language instruction in the United States. Under this program, the Department makes 3-year grants to SEAs to promote systemic improvement of foreign language instruction in the State and 3-year grants to LEAs for model programs of instruction that exhibit the capability to continue beyond the grant period. At least three-quarters of the appropriation must be used for the expansion of foreign language education in the elementary grades. Grant recipients provide a 50 percent match from non-Federal sources. If an applicant demonstrates sufficient hardship, the Department may waive the matching requirement.

The statute also authorizes the “foreign language incentive” program, to make formula payments to public elementary schools that provide students with a program designed to lead to communicative competency in a foreign language. Schools are to receive payments on the basis of the number of elementary school students enrolled in foreign language classes for 45 minutes a day, at least 4 days a week. By statute, a portion of the annual appropriation for Foreign Language Assistance is to be used for these grants; however, in most years, the Congress has included appropriations language to exclude funding for the incentive program.

Beginning in fiscal year 2008, the Congress provided funds for 5-year grants to LEAs, in partnership with institutions of higher education (IHEs), for the establishment or expansion of articulated programs of study in critical-need languages. Funded projects are designed to provide students with a program of study in a critical-need language, beginning in elementary school and continuing through college, enabling them to attain a superior level of proficiency in languages critical to U.S. national security and economic prosperity.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$17,856
2006.....	21,780
2007.....	23,780
2008.....	25,655
2009.....	26,328

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$26.3 million for the Foreign Language Assistance program (FLAP) in fiscal year 2010, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level. This request supports the goal of all students learning a second language and is consistent with other Federal investments that support the expansion of K-12 and postsecondary instruction in critical and other foreign languages.

Our Nation continues to lag behind other industrialized countries in the level and breadth of public foreign language education opportunities and expectations. Preliminary results from the Center for Applied Linguistics' (CAL) K-12 national foreign language survey (2008) indicate that the percentage of public elementary schools offering foreign language instruction decreased from 24 percent to 15 percent in the past decade, which follows a 7 percent increase from 1987 to 1997. The CAL survey also indicates that the majority of public elementary school programs are foreign language experience/exploratory programs designed to provide students with general exposure to a foreign language and culture, rather than to help young students acquire foundational skills for language proficiency. Other research indicates that foreign language programs may affect more than the foreign language skills of students; a large body of research demonstrates a strong correlation between foreign language learning and improved student outcomes in other subjects and assessments. A study of sixth-graders showed that students who received foreign language instruction scored significantly higher in three areas of cognition than students in the control groups. In particular, students who received foreign language instruction scored higher on tasks involving evaluation skills (Foster, K. M., & Reeves, C. K., *Foreign Language in the Elementary School (FLES) improves cognitive skills*, 1989). Furthermore, the College Board's report, "2004 College-Bound Seniors: A Profile of SAT Program Test-Takers," showed that students who completed at least 4 years of foreign-language study scored more than 100 points higher on each section of the SAT than students who took a half year or less.

Moreover, there is a continuing and growing need for a workforce with foreign language proficiency in all languages, including the critical foreign languages. A 2002 survey of large U.S. corporations found that nearly 30 percent of the companies believed they had failed to exploit fully their international business opportunities due to insufficient personnel with international skills. That same survey found that about 40 percent of these companies reported that their international sales are growing more rapidly than domestic sales. Data from the National Security Education Program, a program administered by the Department of Defense, and the American Council of Teachers of Russian show that the median speaking proficiency of

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

American College graduates, before study abroad, in five languages critical to national security (Chinese, Arabic, Russian, Korean, and Japanese) is 1 on a scale of 5, with 3 being the minimum for professionals to practice in another language. Some 80 Federal agencies depend in part on proficiency in more than 100 foreign languages, up from 19 agencies in 1985; and, the Foreign Service reports that only 60 percent of its billets requiring language are at present filled, with waivers applied to another 35 percent (Richard D. Brecht and William Rivers, The National Foreign Language Center, University of Maryland, *Language and National Security: The Federal Role in Building Language Capacity in the US*, 2001).

In fiscal year 2010, the Department would continue to support the teaching of languages traditionally taught in U.S. schools and to give priority to State and local proposals to provide instruction in the critical languages of Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Russian, and other languages in the Indic, Iranian, and Turkic language families. Since 2006, the Department has awarded a competitive priority to LEAs proposing projects to support the teaching and learning of critical foreign languages. Grants are made to LEAs to develop an infrastructure of standards and curriculum for instruction in foreign languages that are critical to national security and economic prosperity. In addition, in fiscal year 2008, the Department awarded eight 5-year grants to partnerships of LEAs and IHEs in order to create articulated programs of study that support students' study of critical foreign languages beginning in the elementary grades and continuing through the postsecondary level.

As in 2008, the Senate Appropriations Committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2009 bill directed the Department not to make grants to schools that are replacing current traditional language programs with critical-need language instruction. The Department will comply with this directive in awarding new grants in 2009 and would implement the same policy in 2010. Additionally, the budget request would continue the policy of not funding the incentive program in fiscal year 2010

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
<u>SEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	0	4	0
Funding for new grants	0	\$750	0
Number of continuing grants	4	0	4
Funding for continuing grants	\$163	0	\$750
<u>LEA Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	0	43	38
Funding for new grants	0	\$8,603	\$7,525
Number of continuing grants	119	50	43
Funding for continuing grants	\$23,095	\$9,495	\$8,603
<u>LEA-IHE Partnership Grants</u>			
Number of new grants	8	26	9
Funding for new grants	\$2,360	\$5,193	\$1,831
Number of continuing grants	0	8	34
Funding for continuing grants	0	\$2,167	\$7,529
Peer review of new award applications	\$37	\$120	\$90

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, and measures. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

This program has been among the programs that receive help from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI), which provides technical assistance to selected programs to promote and increase the capacity of Department staff and grantees to obtain better outcome information from grant programs. The contractor has been working with the Department to strengthen outcome measures, identify and address data deficiencies, and improve processes and reporting instruments so that the Department can collect uniformly high-quality data from grantees. Through this work, the Department has established five new performance measures for LEA grantees and two new performance measures for SEA grantees. LEAs awarded grants prior to fiscal year 2008 reported on four of these measures in 2008. LEAs that receive grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond will report on all five LEA measures, or at least those that are appropriate for their programs. SEAs that receive grant awards in fiscal year 2008 and beyond will report on the two SEA measures.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

The following objectives and performance measures apply to the LEA projects:

Goal: Assist local and State educational agencies in establishing, improving, or expanding foreign language study for elementary and secondary school students.

Objective: *To expand foreign language study in non-critical languages for students served by the FLAP.*

The measures under this objective are: (1) the number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the target non-critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP; and (2) the number of minutes of foreign language instruction in the target non-critical language(s) provided in the schools served by FLAP. Baseline data will be available in summer 2009.

Objective: *To expand foreign language study in critical languages for students served by the FLAP.*

The measures under this objective are: (1) the number of students participating in foreign language instruction in the target critical language(s) in the schools served by FLAP; and (2) the number of minutes of foreign language instruction in the target critical language(s) provided in the schools served by FLAP. Baseline data will be available in summer 2009.

Objective: *To improve the foreign language proficiency of students served by the FLAP.*

The measure is the number of students in FLAP projects who meet ambitious project objectives for foreign language proficiency. Grantees will begin reporting on this measure in 2009, with data available in 2010.

The following objective and two measures apply to the SEA projects:

Objective: *To improve foreign language teaching.*

The measures are: (1) the number of teachers in the State receiving training as a result of the FLAP SEA project; and (2) the number of schools that use the assessments, standards, or curriculum developed by the FLAP SEA projects in the State. Baseline data will be available in summer 2009.

Other Performance Information

In 2004, the Department funded a contract with CAL to produce a report, published in 2004, that provided information for current and prospective FLAP grantees to help them write more coherent proposals and follow through with project activities in a manner that will be useful to the profession. The report included: (1) accepted definitions of foreign language program models, so that everyone uses the same terminology, (2) resources on assessment instruments for K-8 language programs to help schools select the most appropriate measures for their needs, (3) student proficiency goals that may be achieved by each instructional model, so that realistic program goals may be set, and (4) a template for an effective program evaluation and a

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Foreign language assistance

recommended standard format for reporting progress and outcomes in the Annual Performance Report submitted by FLAP grantees.

The Department and the DQI contractor developed and obtained OMB approval for a unique annual performance report that includes the new measures, along with a companion guidance document to assist grantees in completing the reports consistently and accurately. The Department also included these revised measures in the fiscal year 2009 grant competition notice inviting applications.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$410,732	\$410,732	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires States to test all students annually in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school in reading (or language arts) and mathematics, and to administer annual assessments in science for each of three grade spans specified in the law. Furthermore, States must assess the English proficiency of all limited English proficient students annually. The annual assessments in reading and mathematics are used to determine whether States, local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students attaining proficiency by 2013-2014; the science and language proficiency assessments are not required for the determination of adequate yearly progress.

All assessments must be valid and reliable, include measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding of challenging content, and enable achievement results to be disaggregated by major racial and ethnic group, gender, and poverty, disability, English proficiency, and migrant status. The annual assessments can be a critical diagnostic tool for teachers and parents to use in improving instruction and meeting specific student needs.

The Grants for State Assessments program, authorized by Section 6111, provides formula grants to States to pay the costs of developing the standards and assessments required by ESEA Title I. Once a State has put in place those standards and assessments, it may use program funds to pay for the administration of the assessments and for other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and LEAs are held accountable for results. Such activities may include, among other things, developing standards and assessments in subjects other than those required by Title I, expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and for limited English proficient students, professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, and developing multiple measures to ensure the validity and reliability of State assessments.

Under the funding formula, 0.5 of 1 percent of the appropriation is reserved for the Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education and 0.5 of 1 percent goes to the Outlying Areas. From the remaining funds, each State receives \$3 million and then a share of any remaining funds based on its proportion of students ages 5 through 17.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

Section 6112 of the ESEA authorizes Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments, a competitive grant program under which the Department makes 18-month awards to support efforts by States, or consortia of States, to: (1) improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments; (2) measure student academic achievement through the use of multiple measures from multiple sources; (3) chart student progress over time; and (4) use comprehensive instruments such as performance- and technology-based assessments. To date, the Department has made 33 awards under the program.

In each year beginning with fiscal year 2005, the Congress has first provided \$400 million for the State Assessment grants, with any remaining funds going to Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments.

State Assessments is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$411,860
2006.....	407,563
2007.....	407,563
2008.....	408,732
2009.....	410,732

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$410.7 million for State Assessments, the same as the 2009 level. The request would provide \$400 million for State formula grants and \$10.7 million for a new round of awards under the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program.

Funding for these programs will support the development, improvement and administration of State assessments, and would also support the President's goal of creating incentives for a "race to the top" by encouraging States to develop and adopt better standards and assessments. International comparisons of American students' academic achievement show that the curriculum content American students are taught is less rigorous than the content taught in other countries. For example, William S. Schmidt, former director of the U.S. National Research Center for the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) has estimated that, by the end 8th grade American students are approximately 2 years behind their peers in the study of mathematics. (*American Educator*, Fall 2005). Within the United States, the definition of proficiency in reading and mathematics varies widely. A 2007 National Center for Education Statistics analysis that mapped State proficiency standards in reading and mathematics in 4th- and 8th-grade against the National Assessment of Educational Program (NAEP) scale suggested that the content of proficiency standards many States have developed may not be very rigorous (*Mapping 2005 State Proficiency Standards Onto the NAEP Scales*). That analysis showed that, in many States, the score that 4th - and 8th -grade students must

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

attain on State reading and mathematics assessments to be considered proficient would put those students at the basic level in NAEP and, in some States, even below the basic level.

The President has called on our Nation's Governors and chief State school officers to develop tougher standards and assessments that measure not only basic skills, but also whether students possess 21st-century skills like problem-solving and critical thinking, entrepreneurship, and creativity. Although States have largely met the requirements for implementing the assessments required under Title I, the Administration believes that those requirements should be considered basic requirements, not requirements for an ideal assessment system. The Administration is, thus, requesting level funding so that States can use program funds, both formula and competitive, to begin the development and implementation of rigorous college- and career-ready standards and high-quality assessments that are valid and reliable for all students.

The reform agenda supported by the education funds provided under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Recovery Act) create an important context for the use of State Assessment Grant funds in 2010. In addition to helping ensure that States prevent lay-offs and maintain their education funding, the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) in the Recovery Act includes a key assessments objective: implementing college- and career-ready standards and rigorous assessments that will improve both teaching and learning. A portion of the SFSF, \$4.4 billion, will be used to reward States that meet this and other reform goals through the Secretary's Race to the Top (RTTT) Fund (see State Fiscal Stabilization Fund account). States can use State Assessment Grant funds as a valuable resource to help raise the quality of their standards and assessments, making them more competitive in the RTTT award process. In awarding RTTT Funds either to individual or consortia of States, the Secretary will help identify best practices in standards and assessments and other reform objectives, and set a high bar that he will challenge all States to meet.

States could also use their fiscal year 2010 formula funds for other activities authorized in the statute, such as expanding the range of testing accommodations for students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, developing standards and assessments in subjects other than those required by the ESEA, providing professional development aligned with State standards and assessments, ensuring that test results are delivered to districts, schools, and teachers in a timely and informative way.

Enhanced Assessment Instruments

The request includes \$10.7 million to fund Enhanced Assessment Instruments grants. The Administration is exploring strategies to encourage States to leverage the funds they receive under several funding streams in undertaking efforts to improve the quality and rigor of their standards and assessments systems. The Department also plans to maintain a competitive preference for applications that propose to address the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students in order to assist States in improving the quality of their assessments for limited English proficient (LEP) students and students with disabilities and add to the knowledge base about properly assessing these students.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Grants for State Assessments			
Estimated number of awards	52	52	52
Range of awards	\$255-32,918	\$255-32,918	\$255-32,918
Average award	\$7,107	\$7,107	\$7,107
BIE and Outlying Areas	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$4,000
Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments			
Amount for new awards	\$8,657	\$10,657	\$10,657
Number of new awards	6	7	7
Range of awards	\$1,000-\$2,000	\$1,000-2,000	\$1,000-2,000
Peer review of new award applications	\$75	\$75	\$75

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To support States in the development of State assessments.

Objective: *All States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico will have rigorous assessments in both reading/language arts and mathematics in grades three through eight and high school, all of which are aligned with their specific-academic content standards.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

Measure: The number of States (including DC and PR) that have reading/language arts and mathematics assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in grades three through eight and in high school.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	18	0
2006	52	18
2007	52	30
2008	52	39
2009	52	
2010	52	

Source of data: Department of Education, Standards and Assessment External Peer Review Process, Title I review processes, staff recommendations, and decisions by the Secretary. This measure includes assessments that have full approval or “approval with recommendations” and, thus, have met the Title I requirements.

Assessment of progress: In 2005, the Department began formal peer reviews of the standards and assessment systems States developed in compliance with the requirements of ESEA. These reviews determine whether a State met each of the requirements specified in the authorizing statute. The Department determines whether to approve State assessment systems based on the outcome of those reviews. To date, the Department has conducted reviews of all States and has granted “full approval” or “approval with recommendations” to 39 States; full approval means that the State’s standards and assessment system meets all requirements, and approval with recommendations means a State’s system meets all statutory and regulatory requirements, but some pieces of the system could be improved. The GPRA measure, thus, tracks the number of States that have met the Title I requirements. (Previously the Department counted States without full approval or approval with recommendations as approved if they had demonstrated that they complied with most of the ESEA assessment requirements and had plans to come into compliance with any remaining requirements within 2 years of the 2005-06 deadline.)

The remaining 13 States have been categorized as “approval pending.” Of those, 7 are under mandatory oversight status, which required those States to formally submit to the Department a timeline detailing what the State would do to come into compliance with the assessment requirements within one year. Six States have entered into compliance agreements with the Department because it will take them 2 to 3 additional years to come into compliance with the assessment requirements. In addition, the Department placed conditions on the fiscal year 2008 Title I, Part A grant awards of the 13 States that are in approval pending status and withheld Title I, Part A administrative funds from one State.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

Goal: To support States in the development of State assessments.

Objective: By school year 2007-2008, all States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico will have rigorous annual assessments for all students in at least one grade per grade span (three through five, six through eight, and high school) in science, all of which are aligned with their content-specific academic content standards.

Measure: The number of States (including DC and PR) that have science assessments that align with the State's academic content standards for all students in each grade span (grades 3 through 5, 6 through 8, and high school).		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	18	0
2006	15	5
2007	25	5
2008	52	12
2009	52	
2010	52	

Source of data: Department of Education, Standards and Assessment External Peer Review Process, Title I review processes, staff recommendations, and decisions by the Secretary. This measure includes only assessments that have Department full approval or "approval with recommendations" and, thus, have met the Title I requirements.

Assessment of progress: This measure tracks the number of States that have approved science assessments. The number of States that had their science assessments approved by the Department in 2008 was 12, an increase over the number for 2007 but short of the 2008 target of 52.

In 2007, the Department set new measures for the Grants for Enhanced Assessment Instruments program. These measures assess the extent that funded projects produce significant research regarding assessments, in particular regarding accommodations and alternate assessments for students with disabilities, and whether grantees disseminate information on advances in assessments resulting from the Enhanced Assessment Grants. The Department is currently developing a strategy for reviewing grantee products and expects to have baseline data on these measures by the end of 2009.

Efficiency Measures

The Department adopted an efficiency measure that tracks the average number of days per peer review session it takes the Department to issue an initial standards and assessment decision letter to a State. The target for this measure is 90 business days or less.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State assessments

Year	Target	Actual
2006	90	60.45
2007	90	56.00
2008	90	78.23
2009	To be determined	
2010	To be determined	

Assessment of progress: The average number of days to issue an initial decision letter to a State increased between 2007 and 2008, from 56 business days to 78.23, but remained well below the target of 90 business days.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program:

- *Conduct reviews of science assessments to ensure that they meet ESEA requirements.* The Department is requiring all States that do not yet have approved science assessments to submit evidence in 2009 that those assessments meet ESEA requirements. The Department will continue to review science assessments following the same process it used to review reading/language arts and mathematics assessments. The Department has also provided technical assistance to States that have requested help, and will use the information gathered during the review process to provide further technical assistance as needed.
- *Conduct reviews of reading and mathematics assessments for States that have made substantive changes to elements of their approved assessment system in order to ensure they continue to meet ESEA requirements.* In 2008, the Department informed States that they are required to re-submit evidence for peer review whenever they make substantive changes to their assessment systems. The Department reviewed evidence for eight such States late in 2008 and will continue to conduct reviews in 2009. The Department will also continue to provide technical assistance to States as needed.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

(McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Title VII, Subtitle B)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
Annual appropriation	\$65,427	\$65,427	0
Recovery Act appropriation	70,000	0	-\$70,000

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

To ensure that all homeless children and youth have equal access to the same free, appropriate public education available to other children, the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program provides assistance to States, Outlying Areas, and the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) to: (1) establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youths; (2) develop and carry out a State plan for the education of homeless children; and (3) make subgrants to local educational agencies to support the education of those children.

The Department allocates funds to States through a formula based on each State's share of Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies. Each State receives a minimum annual award that is the greater of \$150,000, 0.25 percent of the total, or the amount of the State's fiscal year 2001 award. Under a Memorandum of Agreement with the Department, the BIE receives 1 percent of the appropriation to serve homeless children and youth attending schools funded by the Bureau. The Department is also authorized to reserve 0.1 percent of each year's appropriation for grants to the Outlying Areas and to withhold funds sufficient to conduct technical assistance (if requested by a State educational agency (SEA)), evaluation, and dissemination activities.

A State may reserve up to 25 percent (or in the case of States receiving the minimum award, 50 percent) of its formula grant for State-level activities. With the remaining funds, it must make subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs). LEAs have considerable flexibility in using their subgrant funds, and may use them for such activities as providing enriched supplemental instruction, transportation, professional development, referrals to health care, and other services to facilitate the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children, including preschool-aged children, and youth.

The McKinney-Vento Act explicitly prohibits States that receive program funds from segregating homeless students in separate schools, except for short periods of time for health and safety

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

emergencies or to provide temporary, special, supplementary services. However, it exempts from that prohibition separate schools for homeless children or youth operating in fiscal year 2000 in four counties (San Joaquin, Orange, and San Diego counties in California, and Maricopa County in Arizona) if those schools and their districts meet certain requirements.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided an additional \$70 million in fiscal year 2009 for formula grants to SEAs based on each State's share of the national number of homeless students identified during the 2007–2008 school year. The Department made these grants in March, and SEAs are in the process of making subgrants to LEAs through competitive or formula grants. SEAs may reserve up to 25 percent of the total Homeless funds they receive through regular fiscal year 2009 and ARRA grants for State-level activities. States receiving a minimum award, equal to 0.25 percent of the total fiscal year 2009 and ARRA appropriation, may reserve up to 50 percent of these funds for State-level activities.

Also in 2009, under the Homeless Education Disaster Assistance (HEDA) program that was funded through the 2008 Disaster Relief and Recovery Supplemental Appropriations Act, the Department provided financial assistance to LEAs whose enrollment of homeless students had increased as a result of a natural disaster that occurred in calendar year 2008. While funds for HEDA were not appropriated under the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program, HEDA is supporting activities that addressed the educational and related needs of homeless students consistent with the requirements of the McKinney-Vento Act.

The Education for Homeless Children and Youths program is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year. ARRA funds are available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 2010.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$62,496
2006.....	61,871
2007.....	61,871
2008.....	64,067
2009.....	65,427
Recovery Act	70,000

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$65.4 million for the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program, the same as the 2009 regular appropriation. The funds help maintain services to an especially disadvantaged population that is difficult to identify and serve. Funds support the activities of State coordinators and State subgrants to LEAs. In addition, from the total amount, \$735,000 would support the continuation of technical assistance, evaluation, and dissemination activities to provide assistance to States and LEAs to help them carry out program activities.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

In addition to providing technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs, the Department conducts monitoring visits to SEAs and LEAs to ensure that they are implementing the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program correctly. States are monitored every 3 years. Department staff plan to conclude the current 3-year monitoring cycle in fiscal year 2009 and will likely begin a new cycle in 2010.

This program is an important component of the national effort to end the cycle of homelessness. It also addresses the goals of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by giving States needed assistance in providing homeless children and youth with learning opportunities that enable them to make significant academic progress. Toward that end, the program facilitates the enrollment of homeless students in school and gives them access to services available to other children, such as preschool programs, special education, gifted and talented programs, and career and technical education. Homeless children face many barriers that impede their educational access and success, such as immunization, transportation, and guardianship requirements. This program helps to reduce and eliminate those barriers.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Average State award	\$1,207	\$1,230	\$1,230
Evaluation and dissemination	579	735	735
Amount to Outlying Areas	64	65	65
Amount to BIE	641	654	654

Note: Excludes output measures reflecting HEDA funding in 2008 and ARRA funding in 2009.

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of program results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education as is provided to other children and youth.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

Objective: Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.

Measure: The percentage of homeless children and youth, grades three through eight, included in statewide assessments in reading and mathematics, as reported by LEA subgrantees.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2005	Baseline	50	Baseline	49
2006	53	55	52	54
2007	60	78	60	78
2008	63		63	
2009	66		66	
2010	69		69	

Measure: The percentage of homeless students, grades three through eight, who meet or exceed proficiency on State assessments in reading and mathematics.				
Year	Target – Reading	Actual – Reading	Target – Math	Actual – Math
2005	34	42	26	41
2006	43	45	43	45
2007	50	45	50	46
2008	52		52	
2009	55		55	
2010	57		57	

Source of data: U.S. Department of Education, Consolidated State Performance Report

Assessment of progress: In 2007, the targets for the performance measures that focus on student participation in State assessments in reading and mathematics were exceeded, and performance improved considerably from the previous year.

The program did not meet the targets for the percentages of homeless students meeting or exceeding proficiency in reading or mathematics in 2007, although the mathematics proficiency percentage improved by 1 percentage point from 2006 to 2007. Data for 2008 will be available in spring 2009.

The Department has worked to improve performance and reporting for the participation measures by providing technical assistance and requiring States to report on these measures through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) and the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN). In 2008, Department staff and the program's technical assistance provider, the National Center for Homeless Education (NCHE), developed an action plan for improving student assessment participation rates. Staff from NCHE convened a task force of State coordinators and local district liaisons to support State coordinators in collecting more complete and reliable data for subsequent data collections. NCHE and Department staff discussed the issue with State coordinators during conference calls and at State coordinators' meetings, and NCHE revised and expanded its *Guide to the CSPR*. In addition, NCHE and Department staff have provided specific technical assistance to States that are known to have difficulty providing complete and reliable data. Finally, a voluntary group of State coordinators are developing preliminary findings to help all States improve their student assessment rates. These are expected to be completed in spring 2009.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for homeless children and youths

Efficiency Measure

The Department established one efficiency measure for the Education for Homeless Children and Youths program: the number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to a State after a monitoring visit.

Measure: The number of days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to States after monitoring visits.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	Baseline	46
2006	44	43
2007	41	60
2008	40	42
2009	40	
2010	40	

Assessment of progress: The Department approached but did not meet the 2008 target. Because the Education for Homeless Children and Youths monitoring report is one part of a State monitoring report for several Title I programs, delays in releasing the overall report can cause delays in the release of the Homeless Education report.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part B)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$33,315	\$33,315	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

² Of the amount available to carry out Sections 7204 and 7205, \$500 thousand is to be reserved for a direct grant to the Native Hawaiian Education Council to carry out Section 7204.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education for Native Hawaiians program supports the provision of supplemental education services to the Native Hawaiian population. Competitive grants are awarded to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities in such areas as teacher training, family-based education, gifted and talented education, special education, higher education, and community-based education learning centers. Eligible applicants include Native Hawaiian educational organizations and community-based organizations, public and private nonprofit organizations, agencies, and institutions with experience in developing or operating Native Hawaiian programs or programs of instruction in the Native Hawaiian language, and other entities. In recent years, the appropriation for this program has also included earmarked awards for the Hawaii Department of Education (for school construction) and for the University of Hawaii School of Law (for a Center of Excellence in Native Hawaiian Law).

The program also supports the activities of the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Council uses funds directly and is authorized to make grants to facilitate its coordination of the educational and related services and programs available to Native Hawaiians. It also provides administrative support and financial assistance to island councils authorized by the statute. The Council receives a minimum award of \$500,000 annually.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,907
2008.....	33,315
2009.....	33,315

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$33.3 million for the Education for Native Hawaiians program, the same amount as the fiscal year 2009 appropriation. Program funds would continue to be used for education-related services to the Native Hawaiian population. Federal support for this program is justified by the educational status and continuing needs of Native Hawaiians.

Results from Hawaii's statewide assessment for 2008 show that an achievement gap persists between Native Hawaiian students and their White peers. While 74 percent of White 5th-graders met or exceeded proficiency in reading, only 37 percent of their Native Hawaiian peers did so. In 8th-grade reading, 80 percent of White students met or exceeded proficiency, compared to 49 percent of Native Hawaiians. Scores in mathematics revealed a similar pattern. Twenty-eight percent of Native Hawaiian students met or exceeded proficiency in 5th-grade mathematics and 19 percent in 8th-grade mathematics, compared to 57 percent of White 5th-graders and 45 percent of White 8th-graders. In all assessed grades, 45 percent of Native Hawaiian students demonstrated grade-level proficiency in reading and 26 percent demonstrated grade-level proficiency in mathematics, compared to 77 percent of White students in reading and 55 percent of White students in mathematics.

Program grants support projects intended to improve the educational achievement of Native Hawaiian students by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of those students.

In recent years, the Congress has earmarked a portion of funding for this program for awards to specific entities. The fiscal year 2010 request would continue the appropriation at the fiscal year 2009 level but would discontinue funding for the earmarks.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount for new awards	\$9,683	\$8,450	\$14,106
Number of new awards	23	21	33
Amount for continuation awards	\$20,600	\$21,289	\$18,633
Number of continuation awards	32	32	44
Earmarks in appropriation	\$2,456	\$3,000	0
Native Hawaiian Education Council	\$500	\$500	\$500
Peer review of new award applications	\$76	\$76	\$76

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Native Hawaiians

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008 that, consistent with the GAO recommendation discussed below, more accurately and reliably reflect the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Native Hawaiian students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who demonstrate school readiness in literacy as measured by the Hawaii School Readiness Assessment (HSRA); the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years; and the percentage of students receiving Hawaiian language through a grant under the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in reading on a test of the Hawaiian language. The Department will use these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in fall 2010.

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to existing grantees. According to these measures, in 2008, the number of Native Hawaiian children participating in grantees' early education programs who improved on measures of school readiness and literacy remained relatively steady with the previous year at 60 percent; students participating in the program who met or exceeded proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading increased from 66 percent to 70 percent; and teachers involved in professional development activities through the program that address the unique education needs of Native Hawaiians went up marginally from 79 percent to 80 percent of the total number of teachers who participated in professional development activities through the program. However, each of these indicators lacks the validity and reliability found in more rigorous measures, leading the Department to revise the program's GPRA measures.

Other Performance Information

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on the program in March 2008. GAO found that the Department, the Native Hawaiian Education Council, and the island councils should do more to fulfill their roles and responsibilities under the statute. Regarding the Department specifically, GAO recommended that the Secretary report to Congress on program activities, establish performance measures that cover a greater proportion of the grantees' activities, track grant activities more closely, and provide more guidance and assistance to grantees and the Native Hawaiian Education Council. The Department continues to work on each of these recommendations. Most notably, the Department recently finished revising the GPRA measures and is currently developing guidance for grantees on their implementation.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VII, Part C)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$33,315	\$33,315	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

² Of the amount appropriated for Part C, not less than \$7,000 thousand is to be used to support activities specified in Section 7304(d)(2).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Alaska Native Education Equity program supports supplemental educational programs and services to Alaska Natives. The program awards competitive grants to eligible applicants for a variety of authorized activities, such as teacher training and student enrichment programs. Eligible applicants include Alaska Native organizations, educational entities with experience in developing or operating Alaska Native programs or programs of instruction conducted in Alaska Native languages, cultural and community-based organizations, and other entities. At least \$1 million must be used for parenting education activities.

Projects supported by these grants include the development and implementation of curricula and educational programs that address needs of the Alaska Native student population, professional development activities for educators, the development and operation of home instruction programs for Alaska Native preschool children that help ensure the active involvement of parents in their children's education, family literacy services, student enrichment programs in science and mathematics, and dropout prevention programs.

Section 7304(d)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the following grants to be awarded annually: \$1 million for cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center; \$1 million for a cultural exchange program operated by the Alaska Humanities Forum; \$2 million for an Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement; and \$2 million for the Cook Inlet Tribal Council's Partners for Success program, a dropout prevention program.

All grantees may use no more than 5 percent of the funding for administrative costs.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$34,224
2006.....	33,908
2007.....	33,907
2008.....	33,315
2009.....	33,315

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$33.3 million for the Alaska Native Education Equity program, the same amount as the appropriation for fiscal year 2009. The request would support the continued provision of education-related services to the Alaska Native population.

Data on the educational performance of Alaska Native students demonstrate the continuing need for this program. The spring 2008 administration of Alaska's standards-based assessment indicated that Alaska Native and American Indian students in the State consistently lag behind their White peers in academic performance. (Because Alaska Natives constitute 95 percent of the State's American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) student population, it is reasonable to consider the AI/AN scores as proxies for Alaska Native achievement.) Fifty-eight percent of AI/AN students achieved at least at the proficient level on the 4th-grade reading assessment, compared to 79 percent of all 4th-grade students, and 56 percent of AI/AN students achieved proficiency in mathematics, compared to 75 percent of all 4th-grade students. Eighth-grade assessments show a similar trend. Sixty percent of AI/AN students demonstrated proficiency on the 8th-grade reading assessment, compared to 79 percent of all 8th-grade students, and 51 percent of AI/AN students achieved at the proficient level or higher in mathematics, compared to 68 percent of all 8th-grade students.

Data from the 2007 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show a similar achievement gap. In 4th-grade reading, AI/AN students in Alaska averaged a score of 188, while the overall national average was 221. There were similar differences in 8th-grade reading (236 to 263), 4th-grade mathematics (218 to 240), and 8th-grade mathematics (260 to 281). In terms of proficiency, 10 percent of AI/AN students in Alaska scored at or above proficient in 4th-grade reading, compared to 33 percent of all 4th-graders; 9 percent of AI/AN 8th-graders in Alaska were proficient in reading, compared to 31 percent of all 8th-graders. Sixteen percent of AI/AN students in Alaska scored at or above proficient in 4th-grade mathematics, compared to 39 percent of all 4th-graders; and 12 percent of AI/AN 8th-graders in Alaska were proficient in reading, compared to 32 percent of all 8th-graders.

According to the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development, in the 2007-08 school year, the "event dropout rate" among Alaska Natives and American Indian students in Alaska in grades 7 through 12 was 8.5 percent. This was higher than the rate for any other race/ethnicity in the State and well above the statewide rate of 5.3 percent. Further, Alaska's *Report Card to the Public: 2006-2007* reported that the American Indian/Alaska Native graduation rate was 51 percent, while the statewide figure was 63 percent.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

Alaska's geography and population patterns add to the challenge of delivering quality educational service to Alaska Native students. The State has many rural districts, which often house few schools spread out over large remote areas. The State's largest five school districts enroll 72 percent of the student population, while 40 of the State's 56 districts together enroll less than 10 percent of the State's total student population. Alaska Native students are disproportionately enrolled in small, rural, and isolated schools.

Program grants help address these barriers by developing programs tailored to the educational and cultural needs of Alaska Native students in order to improve their performance in the classroom.

The statute earmarks a significant portion of funding for this program for awards to specific entities. The fiscal year 2010 request would continue the appropriation at the fiscal year 2009 level but would discontinue funding for the earmarks.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount for new awards	\$7,655	\$14,847	\$9,733
Number of new awards	15	30	19
Amount for continuation awards	\$19,505	\$12,211	\$23,427
Number of continuation awards	38	22	45
Amount for award supplements	0	\$102	0
Number of award supplements	0	1	0
Earmarks	\$6,000	\$6,000	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$155	\$155	\$155

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

The Department established new performance measures for this program in 2008 that will more accurately and reliably reflect the effectiveness of this program. The new indicators will measure the percentage of Alaska Native students in schools served by the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards for reading, mathematics, and science on the State's annual assessments; the percentage of Alaska Native children participating in early learning and preschool programs who demonstrate school readiness in language and literacy as measured by the Revised Alaska Developmental Profile (RADP); and the percentage of students in schools served by the program who graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma in 4 years. The Department will use these measures beginning with the fiscal year 2009 cohort of new grantees and will have baseline data in fall 2010.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Alaska Native education equity

The Department continues to collect data on the old indicators, which apply to existing grantees. According to these measures, in 2008 the dropout rate among program participants remains steady since the previous year at 2 percent, Alaska Native children participating in funded early learning and preschool programs who made improvements in school readiness increased ten percentage points to 79 percent, and students participating in the program who met proficiency standards in mathematics, science, and reading increased slightly from 35 percent to 38 percent. However, each of these indicators lacks the validity and reliability found in more rigorous assessment instruments, leading the Department to revise the program's GPRA measures.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

(Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): Indefinite

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$9,489	\$6,989	-\$2,500

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Training and Advisory Services program supports efforts to achieve the intent of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act by aiding educators in preparing, adopting, and implementing plans for desegregation of public schools and in solving equity problems related to race, gender, and national origin. To carry out those activities, the Department awards 3-year grants to regional Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) in each of the 10 Department of Education regions.

The EACs provide services to school districts upon request. Typical activities include disseminating information on successful educational practices and on legal requirements related to nondiscrimination on the basis of race, sex, and national origin in educational programs. Other activities include training designed to develop educators' skills in such areas as the identification of race and sex bias in instructional materials and technical assistance in the identification and selection of appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of a diverse student body.

The fiscal year 2008 Training and Advisory Services program competition included four invitational priorities to encourage applications for projects that would address current needs in the area of educational equity, and particularly barriers to providing all students with a high-quality education. Those four priorities invited applications for: (1) projects to help school boards and other responsible governmental agencies address the over-representation of minorities in special education, the under-representation of minorities in gifted and talented programs, or both, through technical assistance products, services, training, and other informational resources; (2) projects to provide school boards and other responsible governmental agencies with resources, services, and training on successful strategies for providing limited English proficient students with access to a high-quality education; (3) projects to support equity in education by ensuring equal access to well-qualified teachers for all students, including students who are economically disadvantaged or racial and ethnic minorities; and, (4) projects to disseminate, to school boards and other responsible governmental agencies, materials and technical assistance that promote equity by addressing the special needs of high-risk students (such as effective approaches to school dropout prevention and reentry programs), including racial and ethnic minorities.

Fiscal year 2009 appropriations language included \$2.5 million for one-time grants for local educational agencies (LEAs) that are facing challenges in creating student assignment plans that comply with the 2007 Supreme Court decision declaring unconstitutional plans based on

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

race. These grants will enable school districts to obtain technical assistance on developing and implementing student assignment plans that avoid the re-segregation of schools and facilitate student diversity, while maintaining compliance with the Supreme Court decision.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$7,185
2006.....	7,113
2007.....	7,113
2008.....	6,989
2009.....	9,489

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For 2010, the Administration requests \$7.0 million for the Training and Advisory Services program, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level, less the amount appropriated for the special, one-time competition for LEAs implementing new student assignment plans in compliance with the Supreme Court decision. The fiscal year 2010 funds would support the 3rd year of 3-year grants to 10 regional EACs.

To support the goal of equal access for all students, the requested funds for fiscal year 2010 would provide continued support to the EACs for such activities as: training on how to develop curricula so that all students receive a college preparatory education; instructing school officials on how to prevent sexual harassment and combat biases that can lead to hate crimes and bullying; helping educators select appropriate educational programs to meet the needs of limited English proficient students; increasing participation by minorities and females in advanced mathematics and science courses; and working with LEAs to ensure that systemic reform and educational restructuring plans consider the needs of all students. The Centers' activities help to ensure that all children have equal access to quality education and the opportunity to develop strong academic skills in reading, mathematics, and other core subject areas.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Amount for continuation awards	0	\$6,969	\$6,969
Number of continuation awards	0	10	10
Amount for new awards	\$6,907	\$2,420	0
Peer review of new award applications	\$64	\$80	0
Number of new awards	10	10-15	0
Data collection	\$18	\$20	\$20

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data; and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

The Department gathers data to inform the program's performance measures through customer surveys administered by the Library of Congress. About 48 percent of the targeted customer group responded to the 2006 survey. With assistance from the Department's Data Quality Initiative (DQI) contractor, the Department made revisions to the survey and took steps to increase the response rate in 2007, and the response rate increased to almost 76 percent. In 2008, the response rate remained the same; 76 percent (265 out of 350) of the targeted customer group responded.

Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts solve equity problems in education related to race, sex, and national origin.

Objective: *Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.*

Measure: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in eliminating, reducing, or preventing harassment, conflict, and school violence.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		66
2007	67	50
2008	68	56
2009	69	
2010	70	

Assessment of progress: Responses from the past 2 years may more accurately reflect the needs of the target audience, since the response rate increased significantly from 2006 to 2007. Targets are based on the 2006 baseline data and may need to be adjusted for future years.

Measure: The percentage of customers of Equity Assistance Centers that develop, implement, or improve their policies and practices in ensuring that students of different race, sex, and national origin have equitable opportunity for high-quality instruction.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		71
2007	72	82
2008	73	89
2009	74	
2010	75	

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

Assessment of progress: Results have improved for 2 consecutive years. However, approximately 8 percent of respondents indicated that they did not know whether their organization had developed, implemented, or improved its policies and practices in this area.

Measure: The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high quality.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		92
2008	90	95
2009	90	
2010	90	

Assessment of progress: This measure was implemented in 2007. Customers have responded very positively to the quality of the services and products they have received.

Measure: The percentage of customers who report that the products and services they received from the Equity Assistance Centers are of high usefulness to their policies and practices.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		85
2007	86	88
2008	87	94
2009	88	
2010	89	

Assessment of progress: Respondents have responded positively to this measure for 3 years in a row, and the program has exceeded its targets.

Efficiency Measures

The Department implemented a measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Training and Advisory Services program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that each EAC carries over for each year of operations. The EACs have carried over less than 1 percent of their grant funds, on average, for 2006, 2007, and 2008, exceeding the target of 10 percent. The Department established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees following a monitoring visit. The program office will complete a monitoring plan and protocols for use in 2009, and baseline data for this measure will be available in January 2010.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department is undertaking the following improvement efforts for this program.

- *Develop a plan to improve the response rate for the program survey.* Each year the Department administers a customer satisfaction survey to customers of the EACs. The data from the survey serve to inform the performance measures. Working with the DQI contractor, the Department established a plan to continue to improve the response rate

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Training and advisory services

to the survey. The Department will work to implement the plan and also to understand the causes of the number of respondents who indicate that they are not familiar with or did not receive EAC services. Of the 350 customers who were sent a survey in 2008, 10 percent indicated that they were not familiar with or had not received EAC services.

- *Use the findings from the customer satisfaction survey to identify areas in need of improvement. Incorporate these changes into the monitoring plan, as appropriate, as well as annual plans for delivering technical assistance.* The Department's monitoring of EAC grantees has been moved into 2009. Findings from the customer satisfaction survey will be used to update the monitoring plan and plans for technical assistance, as appropriate.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

(Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title VI, Part B)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0^{1,2}

Budget Authority (\$000s):

	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
	\$173,382	\$173,382	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

² The amount appropriated to carry out Title VI, Part B is to be distributed equally between Subparts 1 and 2.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Part B of Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) authorizes two programs to assist rural school districts in carrying out activities to help improve the quality of teaching and learning in their schools. The programs differ in the types of local educational agencies (LEAs) targeted for assistance. The Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve small numbers of students; the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program provides funds to rural LEAs that serve concentrations of poor students, regardless of the LEA's size. Funds appropriated for the Rural Education program are divided equally between the Small, Rural School Achievement and the Rural and Low-Income School programs.

The two programs have similar accountability requirements. Participating LEAs are required to administer an assessment that is consistent with the ESEA Title I assessment requirements. An LEA has 3 years to meet the State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP). If, after 3 years, an LEA is making AYP, it may continue to participate in the program. If it does not meet the State's definition of AYP, an LEA may continue to participate only if it agrees to use all of its applicable funding to carry out Title I school improvement activities.

Rural Education is a forward-funded program. Funds become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available for 15 months through September 30 of the following year.

SMALL, RURAL SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (Subpart 1)

To be eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program, an LEA must: (1) (a) have a total average daily attendance (ADA) of less than 600 students; or (b) serve only schools that are located in counties that have a population density of fewer than 10 persons per square mile; and (2) serve only schools that (a) have a National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) locale code of 7 (rural) or 8 (rural near an urban area); or (b) are located in an area of the State defined as rural by a governmental agency of the State.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Funds are allocated by formula to eligible LEAs based on the number of students in ADA in the schools served by the LEA and the amount the LEA received under certain Federal programs in the previous fiscal year. For each eligible LEA, the Department calculates an initial allocation that is equal to \$20,000 plus \$100 for each child in ADA above 50, with a maximum initial allocation of \$60,000. An LEA's final allocation is equal to the initial allocation minus the amount received in "applicable funding" (funds allocated under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants, and State Grants for Innovative Programs) in the previous fiscal year. The Department makes awards directly to eligible LEAs.

LEAs may use program funds to carry out activities authorized under: (1) Part A of Title I (Grants to Local Educational Agencies); (2) Part A of Title II (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants); (3) Part D of Title II (Educational Technology State Grants); (4) Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students); (5) Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants); (6) Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers); and (7) Part A of Title V (State Grants for Innovative Programs).

Under the program, eligible LEAs also have the flexibility to consolidate funds they receive from these sources to carry out effective activities under any of the authorized programs.

RURAL AND LOW-INCOME SCHOOL PROGRAM (Subpart 2)

To be eligible for funds under the RLIS program, an LEA must: (1) have a Census child-poverty rate of at least 20 percent and (2) serve only schools that have an NCES locale code of 6 (small town), 7 (rural), or 8 (rural near an urban area). Funds are allocated by formula to States based on each State's proportionate share of children in average daily attendance (ADA) in all eligible LEAs. States have the option of allocating funds to eligible LEAs competitively or through a formula based on the number of children in ADA in eligible LEAs within the State. A State may also use an alternative formula to allocate funds if it can demonstrate that an alternative would better target funds to eligible LEAs that serve the highest concentrations of poor students. Currently, however, all States make RLIS awards through the statutory formula. Lastly, the Department reserves one-half of 1 percent of the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and an equal amount for the Outlying Areas.

An LEA located within a State that chooses not to participate in the program may apply directly to the Department for assistance, and the Department may award funds to eligible LEAs within non-participating States on a competitive basis or by formula. However, all States with eligible LEAs have agreed, as a part of consolidated State plans submitted to the Department in 2002, to participate in the program.

LEAs use program funds for: (1) teacher recruitment and retention; (2) teacher professional development; (3) educational technology; (4) parental involvement activities; (5) activities authorized under Part A of Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); (6) activities authorized under Part A of Title I (Grants to LEAs); and (7) activities authorized under Title III (Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students).

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$170,624
2006.....	168,918
2007.....	168,918
2008.....	171,854
2009.....	173,382

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration is requesting \$173.4 million for the Rural Education program. The request recognizes that rural LEAs face significant challenges in implementing some of the provisions and meeting the objectives of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The program provides rural districts with resources for meeting those challenges.

According to the report *Status of Education in Rural America*, released by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in July 2007, during the 2003-04 school year over half of all operating school districts and one-third of the Nation's public schools were located in rural areas, with one-fifth of all public school students enrolled at these schools. The small size of many rural schools and districts presents a different set of problems from those of urban schools and districts. For example, rural schools and districts generally cannot derive the benefits of economies of scale and, thus, face greater per-pupil costs in providing staff or transportation services. Adjusted for geographic cost differences, operating expenditures per student in 2003-04 were higher in rural districts than in city and suburban districts.

Poverty, less access to advanced courses, and low expectations are other challenges that NCES found are facing many rural school children. Nearly half of students in rural remote areas attended schools with moderate or high poverty levels. This is greater than all other locales except large and mid-size cities. Sixty-nine percent of rural high school students attended schools that offered Advanced Placement courses, compared to 93 percent of city and 96 percent of suburban high school students. In 2004, 42 percent of rural students had parents who expected their child's highest educational attainment to be less than a bachelor's degree, compared to 30 percent in cities and 25 percent in suburban areas. Rural parents themselves generally had lower levels of education; 21 percent had a bachelor's degree or higher, compared to a national average of 28 percent. College enrollment among rural individuals 18- to 24-years old was the lowest of all locales, at 27 percent, compared to a national average of 34 percent.

In addition, because of size and location, many small, rural districts face difficulty in meeting the ESEA requirement that students receive instruction in the core academic subjects from teachers who are fully certified by the State and have demonstrated competency in the subjects they teach. Rural teachers are frequently called upon to teach multiple subjects, which challenges teachers to obtain multiple certifications needed to meet the statutory definition of "highly qualified." A 2003 national survey conducted by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) found that 57 percent of secondary school teachers in rural schools with 250 or fewer students

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

teach multiple subjects. Edvantia, the successor to AEL, conducted another national study in 2005, which found the issue of “highly qualified” requirements, geographic and social isolation, and lower pay to be the greatest challenges to rural district recruitment and retention of teachers. Rural Education funds can help rural LEAs meet the challenge of recruiting and retaining a staff of highly qualified teachers.

Rural districts frequently receive allocations under State formula grant programs that are too small to allow the LEA to address effectively the purposes for which the funds are appropriated. For example, in fiscal year 2008, the median total allocation received by districts eligible for SRSA under four current Federal formula grant programs (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, Educational Technology State Grants, State Grants for Innovative Programs, and Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants) was \$17,418.

Recognizing that rural districts frequently receive small allocations from Federal formula grants, the Rural Education statute provides flexibility, through the “alternative uses of funds” authority, to LEAs eligible to receive funds under the SRSA program. This flexibility, commonly referred to as “REAP-Flex,” is important to these districts because it allows them to make more effective use of their small Federal formula allocations. An eligible LEA may use its formula allocations under the covered programs to carry out authorized activities or for activities authorized under Part A of Title I, Title III (Language Instruction), or Part B of Title IV (21st Century Community Learning Centers). Fifty-six percent of eligible districts notified their respective State of their intention to take advantage of this authority in fiscal year 2007. Yet, even when the eligible LEAs consolidate their allocations under these programs, they typically do not have enough money to provide effective educator professional development, strengthen school safety, or address the other statutory objectives in a meaningful manner. Rural Education program funds help to make up the difference and assist rural LEAs in financing and implementing approaches to meeting NCLB requirements and addressing the other challenges they face.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Small, rural school achievement			
Total funding	\$85,927	\$86,691	\$86,691
Estimated number of LEAs receiving grants	4,084	4,084	4,084
Average LEA grant	\$21	\$21	\$21
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$80	\$81	\$81
Range of awards to LEAs	0-\$60	0-\$60	0-\$60

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s) – continued

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Rural and low-income schools			
Total funding	\$85,927	\$86,691	\$86,691
Amount for State grants	\$84,967	\$85,814	\$85,825
Amount for BIE	\$430	\$433	\$433
Amount for outlying areas	\$430	\$433	\$433
Amount for Evaluation	\$100	\$11	0
Estimated number of States receiving grants	40	40	40
Estimated number of LEAs receiving subgrants	1,486	1,486	1,486
Average State grant	\$2,124	\$2,145	\$2,146
Average LEA subgrant	\$57	\$58	\$58
Average award per student (whole \$)	\$28	\$28	\$28
Range of awards to States	0-\$7,344	0-\$7,418	0-\$7,418
Estimated range of subgrants to LEAs	\$2-627	\$2-627	\$2-627

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

This section presents selected program performance information, including, for example, GPRA goals, objectives, measures, and performance targets and data, and an assessment of the progress made toward achieving program results. Achievement of results is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in previous years and those requested in FY 2010 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Goal: Raise educational achievement of students in small, rural school districts.

Objective: *Local educational agencies (LEAs) participating in Rural Education programs will make AYP after the third year.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Measure: The percentage of SRSA-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		95
2006	95	92
2007	96	92
2008	96	
2009	97	
2010	97	

Measure: The percentage of RLIS-participating LEAs that make adequate yearly progress after 3 years.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005		58
2006	64	53
2007	70	58
2008	76	
2009	82	
2010	88	

Assessment of Progress: When LEAs reported baseline data for 2005, the Department found that 95 percent of LEAs participating in SRSA and 58 percent of LEAs participating in RLIS made AYP. With the baseline data in place, the Department established performance targets to reflect a yearly increase of 1 percentage point every 2 years over the baseline in the number of SRSA LEAs that make AYP, in order to reach 100 percent by the year 2014. Similarly, the Department also adjusted the performance targets for the RLIS program to reflect an annual increase of 6 percentage points over the baseline in the number of LEAs that make AYP. SRSA grantees of 3 or more years in the program did not demonstrate a gain in 2007. After a decrease in 2006, RLIS grantees of 3 or more years in the program returned to 58 percent meeting AYP in 2007. However, SRSA continues to have a greater proportion of grantees making AYP than RLIS, perhaps reflecting the fact that RLIS districts are larger and, thus, may have more subgroups that are counted in AYP determinations. An increase in the number of LEAs that have now participated in each of the programs for 3 or more years is also partially responsible for the programs not meeting the established targets. Data for 2008 will be available in summer 2009.

Objective: *Students enrolled in LEAs participating in Rural Education programs will score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		70
2008	74	
2009	78	
2010	82	

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		66
2008	71	
2009	76	
2010	81	

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in reading/language arts in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		69
2008	74	
2009	79	
2010	84	

Measure: The percentage of students enrolled in LEAs participating in the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program who score proficient or better on States' assessments in mathematics in each year through the 2013-2014 academic year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2007		64
2008	70	
2009	75	
2010	80	

Assessment of Progress: The Department established baseline data for student proficiency in both programs from the 2006-07 school year. Among SRSA districts, 70 percent of students scored proficient or better on their State reading assessment, while 66 percent scored proficient in mathematics. Students in RLIS districts had similar results, with 69 percent proficiency in reading and 64 percent proficiency in mathematics. The performance targets for these measures reflect the Department's goal that 100 percent of students enrolled in districts participating in both the SRSA and RLIS programs will be proficient by 2014. Data for fiscal year 2008 are expected in August 2009.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

Objective: *Eligible rural school districts will use the Rural Education program flexibility authority.*

Measure: The percentage of eligible school districts utilizing the Rural Education Achievement Program flexibility authority.		
Year	Target	Actual
2005	65	56
2006	65	60
2007	65	56
2008	65	
2009	65	
2010	65	

Assessment of Progress: While this measure was developed to capture the percentage of eligible districts actually using the flexibility authority, the best available information is on the number of districts reporting to the State their intent use this authority. Since there is little reason to believe that LEAs would provide this notification and not use the authority, reported intent serves as a reasonable proxy. In fiscal year 2007, 56 percent of eligible districts reported their intent to use the flexibility authority.

Program Efficiency Measures

Measure: The percentage of SRSA program grants awarded by August 30 of each fiscal year.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		100
2007	80	100
2008	80	100
2009	80	
2010	80	

Assessment of Progress: Due to difficulty in processing its over 4,000 SRSA grants to LEAs in a timely manner in the early years of the program, the Department established a measure to track the efficiency of this task. The Department has had great success since creating the measure by not only exceeding its target of obligating 80 percent of SRSA awards by August 30, but by obligating 100 percent each year.

Other Performance Information

A 2006 evaluation conducted by the Urban Institute examined the use of REAP-Flex authority in rural school districts. The study found that 80 percent of SRSA-eligible districts that exercised the authority used its flexibility to maintain a stable level of effort for ongoing activities that had been affected by Federal and State budget cuts. Similarly, over 80 percent of REAP-Flex participants reported using the authority to target achievement outcomes, including 73 percent that had targeted math and 77 percent that had targeted reading.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural education

The Department is currently conducting an evaluation of the RLIS program. The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation at the State and district levels. Specifically, the Department will obtain information on State RLIS priorities and monitoring, State progress toward achieving RLIS goals, characteristics of RLIS districts, uses of RLIS funds, and student achievement and AYP trends in participating districts. The final report is expected to be available in spring 2010.

Section 6224(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act requires the Department to prepare a biennial report to Congress on the RLIS program. The report must describe the methods SEAs used to award grants and provide technical assistance, how LEAs and schools used RLIS funds, and the progress made toward meeting the goals and objectives outlined in the SEA applications. The Department will submit its biennial report to Congress for school years 2004-05 and 2005-06 in spring 2009.

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department has taken the following actions to improve the performance of this program:

- *Collect performance data to gauge the program's impact on improving student proficiency in reading/language arts and mathematics in rural districts.* The Department developed a means for reporting reliable student achievement data and established baseline data from the 2006-07 school year.
- *Evaluate the Rural and Low-Income School program to examine the types of activities and academic progress that these funds support.* In the fiscal year 2008, the Department initiated an evaluation that draws data from a nationally representative sample of eligible LEAs to provide information about how RLIS funds are targeted, the impact of these funds on student achievement, and the types of improvement activities supported by RLIS funds in districts that fail to meet their State's definition of adequate yearly progress. The final report will be available in spring 2010.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

(Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, Section 105(f)(1)(B)(iii))

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): \$19,835¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$17,687	\$17,687	0

¹ The Act authorizes \$12,230 thousand for the Federated States of Micronesia and \$6,100 thousand for the Republic of the Marshall Islands for fiscal year 2005 and an equivalent amount, as adjusted for inflation (calculated as two thirds of the percentage change in the U.S. Gross Domestic Product Implicit Price Deflator, or 5 percent, whichever is less in any 1 year) for each of the succeeding fiscal years through 2023. The fiscal year 2010 authorization is calculated based on inflation estimates as of February 2008.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-188) authorizes supplemental education grants to the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) and the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI). The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in most domestic formula grant programs funded by the Departments of Education, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Labor (DOL). As a replacement, beginning in fiscal year 2005, the Act authorizes supplemental education grants, appropriated to the Department of Education in an amount that is roughly equivalent to the total formula funds that these entities received in fiscal year 2004 under the Federal formula programs for which they are no longer eligible. These Supplemental Education grants augment the funds that the FSM and the RMI receive for general education assistance under their Compacts of Free Association with the U.S. Government.

The Act eliminated the participation of the FSM and the RMI in the following Department of Education programs: Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies; Career and Technical Education Grants under Title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006; Adult Basic and Literacy Education State Grants; Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunities Grants; and Federal Work-Study. However, they remain eligible for participation in other Department programs, including the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act State Grants and programs under Part A, Subpart 1 of Title IV of the Higher Education Act, and in ED, HHS, and DOL competitive programs. Also, the Act eliminated FSM and RMI participation in programs under Title I (other than Job Corps) of the Workforce Investment Act (DOL) and Head Start (HHS).

The Department of Education is required to transfer funds appropriated for Supplemental Education Grants to the Department of the Interior for disbursement to the RMI and the FSM not later than 60 days after the appropriation becomes available. Appropriations are to be used and monitored in accordance with an interagency agreement between the four cabinet agencies and in accordance with the "Fiscal Procedure Agreements" entered into by the FSM and the RMI

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

with the U.S. Government. These agreements call for the funds to be used at the local school level for direct educational services focused on school readiness, early childhood education, elementary and secondary education, vocational training, adult and family literacy, and the transition from high school to postsecondary education and careers. They may not be used for construction or remodeling, the general operating costs of school systems, or teacher salaries (except the salaries of teachers who carry out programs supported by the grants).

The FSM and RMI may request technical assistance from ED, HHS, or DOL, on a reimbursement basis. Each year's appropriations act has also permitted the FSM and the RMI to reserve up to 5 percent of their grants for administration and such technical assistance.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$18,183
2006.....	18,001
2007.....	18,001
2008.....	17,687
2009.....	17,687

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

The Administration requests \$17.7 million, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level, to maintain funding for Supplemental Education Grants to the RMI and FSM. The request would ensure the continuation of supplementary education services for residents of the RMI and the FSM. Over 40 percent of the funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006 was used to support early childhood education. The RMI and FSM have also used Supplemental Education Grants for education improvement programs, vocational and skills training, and professional development.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Grant to Federated States of Micronesia	\$11,801	\$11,801	\$11,801
Grant to Republic of the Marshall Islands	5,886	5,886	5,886

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

The Supplemental Education Grants program was funded for the first time in fiscal year 2005. The Department has not established performance measures for this program because it is operated by the Department of the Interior.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Supplemental education grants

A December 2006 Government Accountability Office report entitled *Compacts of Free Association: Micronesia and the Marshall Islands Face Challenges in Planning for Sustainability, Measuring Progress, and Ensuring Accountability* documented both the continuing need for improvement in the public education systems of the Freely Associated States and the difficulties in obtaining and reporting performance data for this program. The RMI, according to the report, is not able to measure progress towards its educational goals because the data the Republic collects are inadequate, inconsistent, and incomplete. Tests to measure achievement were not administered in 2005 and 2006, and some of the tests the Republic has used were not aligned with the curriculum used in the RMI and, thus, are not adequate measures of student achievement. The FSM also lacks consistent performance outcomes and measures; measures and outcomes have been established but constantly change, making it difficult to track progress. Both entities face continuing challenges in improving the quality of education due to a lack of qualified teachers, poor facilities, and a high absentee rate among students and teachers.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

(Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002, Title II, Section 203)

FY 2010 Authorization (\$000s): 0¹

Budget Authority (\$000s):

<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Change</u>
\$57,113	\$57,113	0

¹ The program is authorized in FY 2009 through appropriations language. Continued funding is proposed for this program in FY 2010 through appropriations language.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Education Technical Assistance Act (ETA) authorizes support for not less than 20 comprehensive centers to provide training, technical assistance, and professional development in reading, mathematics, and technology, particularly to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools that do not meet State targets for adequate yearly progress under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). By statute, the Department is required to establish at least one center in each of the 10 geographic regions served by the regional educational laboratories. Allocations for regional centers are to be determined on the basis of the number of school-aged children, the proportion of disadvantaged students in the various regions, the increased cost burdens of service delivery in sparsely populated areas, and the number of schools identified for improvement under Section 1116(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Department provided initial grants for 20 new Comprehensive Centers from fiscal year 2005 funds, and a grant for 1 additional center from fiscal year 2006 funds. The system includes 16 *regional centers* that work with the State educational agencies (SEAs) within their geographic regions to help them implement school and district improvement measures and objectives. The regional centers provide technical assistance to SEAs to increase their capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting the key goals of the ESEA.

In addition, instead of requiring each regional center to have in-depth knowledge of all aspects of school improvement – from instruction to teacher quality to assessment design – the Department funded five *content centers*, with one center specializing in each of the following five content areas: assessment and accountability; instruction; teacher quality; innovation and improvement; and high schools. Each content center brings together resources and expertise to provide analyses, information, and materials in its focus area for use by the network of regional centers and SEAs.

Each center developed a 5-year plan for carrying out authorized activities. The plan of each regional center addresses the needs of the SEAs in its region in meeting the student achievement goals of the ESEA. The content centers' plans address the priorities established

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

by the Department and the States. Each center has an advisory board that advises the center on: (1) allocation of resources; (2) strategies for monitoring and addressing the educational needs of the region (or the needs of the regional centers in the case of the content centers); (3) maintaining a high standard of quality in the performance of its activities; and (4) carrying out the center's activities in a manner that promotes progress toward improving student academic achievement.

The statute requires that the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, a component under the Department's Institute of Education Sciences, provide for an ongoing independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers to determine the extent to which each center meets its objectives.

Funding levels for the past 5 fiscal years were as follows:

	(\$000s)
2005.....	\$56,825 ¹
2006.....	56,257
2007.....	56,257
2008.....	57,113
2009.....	57,113

¹ The appropriation supported initial grants to 20 new Comprehensive Centers and costs associated with the close-out of the antecedent Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers.

FY 2010 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration requests \$57.1 million, the same as the fiscal year 2009 level, to support the Comprehensive Centers program and the first year of funding for the second cohort of centers funded under the Education Technical Assistance Act of 2002.

The Comprehensive Centers program's first cohort of grantees under the 2002 ETA was funded in 2005. The 16 regional centers have focused entirely on assisting SEAs in the implementation of ESEA requirements and helping the SEAs to increase their own capacity to assist districts and schools in meeting their student achievement goals. The five content centers have identified, organized, and translated key research and provided in-depth knowledge, expertise, and analyses to the regional centers and the States in each of their content areas: assessment and accountability, high schools, innovation and improvement, and teacher quality. The Department has begun planning for a new competition and will use findings from the current evaluation and grantee monitoring to inform the development of the notice inviting applications. This competition is scheduled for spring 2010, and the fiscal year 2010 appropriation will provide the first year of funding for the new grants.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

Now in their fifth and final year of funding, the 16 regional centers focus a much greater percentage of their work on long-term, multi-year projects. Some examples of this work include helping SEAs to:

- Analyze, revise and improve State standards;
- Increase their understanding of assessment issues, including alternate assessments, modified assessments, and formative assessments;
- Investigate, design, and implement models of “tiered intervention” for struggling students; and,
- Analyze existing institutional structures and helping develop improvements to statewide systems of support.

The content centers have continued to supply research-based products and services for the regional centers and the States they serve. Their work has also evolved, with less emphasis on creating products and an increasing emphasis on assisting the regional centers in using existing products. The content centers have increased their professional development efforts, offering “webinars,” online professional learning communities, and in-person assistance to help regional staffs provide more coordinated assistance to SEAs. In year 4 of their grants, 13 centers (both regional and content centers) received \$2.5 million dollars in supplemental funds to assist States in addressing issues related to assessments for students with disabilities and those with limited English proficiency.

For fiscal year 2010, the Administration envisions that the centers receiving grants through the new competition will help States increase their own abilities to support their districts and schools, providing technical assistance in at least the following areas:

- Developing infrastructures to improve teaching and learning, with a focus on helping students graduate from high school with the necessary skills and coursework to succeed in college;
- State and district improvement processes and strategies designed to ensure the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers and principals;
- Developing and implementing statewide systems of support; and,
- Expanding or enhancing large-scale State and district data systems, including by making data more accessible at the State, district, and school levels.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES (\$000s)

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Comprehensive centers			
Number of centers	21	21	20-25
Center awards	\$55,764	\$57,113	\$57,013
Average award	\$2,655	\$2,720	\$2,534
Evaluation	\$1,349	0	0
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	\$100

PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Performance Measures

In response to deficiencies identified in the antecedent comprehensive centers, the Department placed strong emphasis on creating a performance-based framework for the new centers that included, among other things, annual performance measures. These measures were created as part of a Department-wide effort to bring consistency to the assessment of performance across technical assistance programs through the creation of common performance measures. These measures are designed to analyze the services provided by the centers, the extent to which each of the centers meets the objectives of its respective plan, and whether their services meet the educational needs of the SEAs, LEAs, and schools.

The performance measures for the comprehensive centers are: (1) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high quality by an independent review panel of qualified experts or individuals with appropriate expertise to review the substantive content of the products and services; (2) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high relevance to educational policy or practice by target audiences; and (3) the percentage of all products and services that are deemed to be of high usefulness to educational policy or practice by target audiences.

As part of the Department's national evaluation of the Comprehensive Centers, initiated in 2006, the contractor will analyze and report on information gathered from the first cohort of grantees. Panel reviews and surveys conducted in 2007, 2008, and to be conducted for the last time in 2009, have informed the performance measures. For program year 2007, the evaluator reported that 34 percent of the centers' products and services reviewed by the independent review panel were deemed to be of high quality; 74 percent of the centers' products and services were deemed to be of high relevance, as determined by the target audiences; and, 48 percent of the centers' products and services were deemed to be of high usefulness by the target audiences.

In addition to providing data for the performance measures, the evaluation will assess: (1) the extent to which the centers have met the objectives of their respective technical assistance

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

plans and the educational needs of SEAs, and (2) whether the centers' assistance has expanded SEAs' capacity to provide technical assistance to help LEAs and schools meet their statutory requirements. The evaluation will also examine the centers' responses to changing SEA technical assistance needs, SEAs' reliance on the centers compared to other technical assistance sources, the overall costs for SEAs in providing ESEA-related technical assistance, and the estimated dollar value of the centers' products and services to SEAs. Evaluation findings will be available in an interim report (fall 2009) and a final report (2010). In order to more fully capture the complexity of the technical assistance work, the contractor will also produce case studies, based on a review of the work in 10 SEAs. The case studies will be available in 2011.

Efficiency Measures

The Department is implementing a common measure of administrative efficiency to assess the Comprehensive Centers program and other technical assistance programs. The measure is the percentage of grant funds that the centers carry over for each year of operations. Data for the measure are available each year in early September, after Department staff have reviewed data for the previous 12-month budget cycle, and are presented in the table below. The 40 percent carry over in the baseline year is likely the result of the centers receiving their initial grant awards several months into the beginning of the award year. The Department also established a second efficiency measure for the program: the number of working days following a monitoring visit that it takes the Department to send a monitoring report to grantees. The program office will implement this new measure and establish a baseline beginning in 2009.

Measure: The percentage of Comprehensive Center grant funds carried over in each year of the project.		
Year	Target	Actual
2006		40
2007	30	15
2008	20	6
2009	10	
2010	10	

Program Improvement Efforts

The Department recognized that the antecedent Centers had succeeded in establishing a good customer base and offering services to school districts with high rates of poverty, but was concerned about the lack of any national evaluation findings demonstrating that the program was providing effective technical assistance to those entities. The evaluation and customer service surveys that were used were not of sufficient scope and quality to support specific program improvements. The Department addressed these deficiencies in two major ways: the implementation of the program's performance measures and support for the current national evaluation.

In addition, the Department agreed to take the following steps to continue to support overall program improvements:

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Comprehensive centers

- *Create a plan for technical assistance and program management, using the data from the national evaluation on the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the technical assistance provided by the Centers.*
- *Complete a plan for monitoring the performance of the Comprehensive Centers, based on findings from the pilot monitoring visits of the Centers.*
- *Develop a notice inviting applications that takes into account the findings of the national evaluation, monitoring findings, and feedback from grantees and their customers.*

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Improving Teacher Quality State Grants

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	47,018,200	0	47,445,141	47,663,159	218,018
Alaska	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Arizona	48,635,038	0	49,231,152	49,507,881	276,729
Arkansas	28,692,584	0	29,159,912	29,299,257	139,345
California	332,854,904	0	327,274,089	328,738,570	1,464,481
Colorado	32,975,388	0	33,871,478	34,038,778	167,300
Connecticut	26,679,875	0	26,586,909	26,686,346	99,437
Delaware	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
District of Columbia	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Florida	133,957,142	0	132,654,016	133,266,541	612,525
Georgia	79,401,753	0	80,697,792	81,119,214	421,422
Hawaii	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Idaho	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Illinois	117,680,290	0	118,636,772	119,125,244	488,472
Indiana	50,368,699	0	50,654,736	50,891,568	236,832
Iowa	22,318,054	0	22,468,490	22,560,433	91,943
Kansas	22,705,842	0	22,859,226	22,952,355	93,129
Kentucky	45,107,765	0	45,503,916	45,692,343	188,427
Louisiana	65,226,437	0	63,944,163	64,174,025	229,862
Maine	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Maryland	41,357,474	0	41,195,382	41,354,033	158,651
Massachusetts	51,793,550	0	51,863,310	52,057,750	194,440
Michigan	112,109,766	0	112,630,356	113,044,896	414,540
Minnesota	38,482,785	0	38,914,588	39,067,485	152,897
Mississippi	42,781,932	0	42,815,118	42,985,956	170,838
Missouri	50,977,867	0	50,724,671	50,947,434	222,763
Montana	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Nebraska	14,263,975	0	14,263,044	14,325,544	62,500
Nevada	15,524,495	0	15,809,352	15,900,541	91,189
New Hampshire	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
New Jersey	65,311,095	0	64,978,140	65,232,315	254,175
New Mexico	23,044,481	0	22,956,018	23,053,207	97,189
New York	227,484,226	0	227,463,639	228,224,083	760,444
North Carolina	68,094,000	0	67,861,778	68,228,393	366,615
North Dakota	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Ohio	107,784,210	0	108,358,878	108,802,171	443,293
Oklahoma	33,969,928	0	34,231,971	34,389,542	157,571
Oregon	28,900,179	0	28,643,678	28,773,884	130,206
Pennsylvania	115,223,435	0	115,069,886	115,490,121	420,235
Rhode Island	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
South Carolina	37,978,750	0	37,791,379	37,977,369	185,990
South Dakota	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Tennessee	51,217,243	0	52,218,514	52,483,775	265,261
Texas	247,415,976	0	247,763,774	248,974,474	1,210,700
Utah	19,074,503	0	19,402,548	19,495,783	93,235
Vermont	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
Virginia	52,503,196	0	52,711,113	52,948,214	237,101
Washington	48,000,430	0	48,045,249	48,257,639	212,390
West Virginia	23,713,215	0	23,381,599	23,453,543	71,944
Wisconsin	46,372,266	0	46,889,739	47,071,739	182,000
Wyoming	13,987,032	0	13,986,101	14,048,601	62,500
American Samoa	3,480,950	0	3,497,906	3,497,906	0
Guam	5,134,923	0	5,155,230	5,155,230	0
Northern Mariana Islands	1,639,057	0	1,646,498	1,646,498	0
Puerto Rico	92,534,113	0	92,389,324	92,792,735	403,411
Virgin Islands	4,347,931	0	4,365,417	4,365,417	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	14,602,861	0	14,665,051	14,665,051	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	14,676,242	0	27,238,745	14,738,745	(12,500,000)
Total	2,935,248,441	0	2,947,749,000	2,947,749,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Mathematics and Science Partnerships

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	3,149,164	0	3,293,677	3,293,677	0
Alaska	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Arizona	3,752,270	0	3,954,015	3,954,015	0
Arkansas	1,980,113	0	2,137,830	2,137,830	0
California	21,906,182	0	20,037,656	20,037,656	0
Colorado	1,861,934	0	2,164,079	2,164,079	0
Connecticut	1,135,602	0	1,104,970	1,104,970	0
Delaware	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
District of Columbia	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Florida	8,676,445	0	8,241,593	8,241,593	0
Georgia	5,563,620	0	6,001,369	6,001,369	0
Hawaii	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Idaho	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Illinois	6,250,212	0	6,574,304	6,574,304	0
Indiana	3,039,746	0	3,137,163	3,137,163	0
Iowa	1,050,636	0	1,101,745	1,101,745	0
Kansas	1,101,001	0	1,153,093	1,153,093	0
Kentucky	2,677,458	0	2,811,500	2,811,500	0
Louisiana	4,033,542	0	3,603,480	3,603,480	0
Maine	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Maryland	1,799,682	0	1,746,187	1,746,187	0
Massachusetts	2,362,518	0	2,387,083	2,387,083	0
Michigan	5,644,380	0	5,821,453	5,821,453	0
Minnesota	1,603,816	0	1,749,902	1,749,902	0
Mississippi	2,718,752	0	2,730,622	2,730,622	0
Missouri	3,116,959	0	3,032,996	3,032,996	0
Montana	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Nebraska	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Nevada	1,073,276	0	1,169,537	1,169,537	0
New Hampshire	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
New Jersey	3,018,806	0	2,908,426	2,908,426	0
New Mexico	1,511,150	0	1,481,848	1,481,848	0
New York	10,867,365	0	10,864,164	10,864,164	0
North Carolina	5,265,048	0	5,188,797	5,188,797	0
North Dakota	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Ohio	5,902,883	0	6,098,332	6,098,332	0
Oklahoma	2,209,464	0	2,298,304	2,298,304	0
Oregon	1,818,976	0	1,733,440	1,733,440	0
Pennsylvania	5,586,114	0	5,536,748	5,536,748	0
Rhode Island	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
South Carolina	2,757,962	0	2,695,869	2,695,869	0
South Dakota	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Tennessee	3,552,527	0	3,890,372	3,890,372	0
Texas	17,989,209	0	18,111,705	18,111,705	0
Utah	942,150	0	1,053,000	1,053,000	0
Vermont	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Virginia	2,805,969	0	2,877,236	2,877,236	0
Washington	2,658,511	0	2,674,768	2,674,768	0
West Virginia	1,174,794	0	1,063,654	1,063,654	0
Wisconsin	2,098,638	0	2,273,620	2,273,620	0
Wyoming	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
American Samoa	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Guam	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Northern Mariana Islands	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Puerto Rico	7,398,451	0	7,351,085	7,351,085	0
Virgin Islands	890,414	0	890,416	890,416	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	894,888	0	894,890	894,890	0
Total	178,977,665	0	178,978,000	178,978,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Educational Technology State Grants

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	4,003,539	10,474,145	4,258,912	1,599,145	(2,659,767)
Alaska	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Arizona	4,783,909	12,449,920	5,062,263	1,881,759	(3,180,504)
Arkansas	2,713,488	7,158,799	2,913,812	1,093,560	(1,820,252)
California	30,565,347	70,610,145	28,741,327	10,604,904	(18,136,423)
Colorado	2,518,910	7,044,669	2,867,294	1,060,276	(1,807,018)
Connecticut	1,983,450	4,648,392	1,890,126	710,850	(1,179,276)
Delaware	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
District of Columbia	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Florida	12,399,926	30,205,190	12,291,862	4,504,546	(7,787,316)
Georgia	8,253,341	22,071,475	8,984,295	3,327,319	(5,656,976)
Hawaii	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Idaho	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Illinois	10,175,076	26,523,208	10,796,398	3,993,053	(6,803,345)
Indiana	4,483,444	10,930,774	4,449,231	1,656,995	(2,792,236)
Iowa	1,330,059	3,365,121	1,369,848	512,002	(857,846)
Kansas	1,777,736	4,552,424	1,851,098	689,947	(1,161,151)
Kentucky	3,888,331	9,904,203	4,031,308	1,501,732	(2,529,576)
Louisiana	5,511,021	12,151,044	4,946,054	1,878,974	(3,067,080)
Maine	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Maryland	3,493,015	8,498,656	3,455,754	1,274,239	(2,181,515)
Massachusetts	4,250,448	10,576,105	4,295,868	1,606,969	(2,688,899)
Michigan	9,784,639	24,524,838	9,982,393	3,681,280	(6,301,113)
Minnesota	2,339,875	6,153,079	2,504,459	932,914	(1,571,545)
Mississippi	3,433,141	8,518,951	3,464,076	1,293,792	(2,170,284)
Missouri	4,186,240	9,765,833	3,975,373	1,497,492	(2,477,881)
Montana	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Nebraska	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Nevada	1,524,619	4,251,273	1,728,684	629,349	(1,099,335)
New Hampshire	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
New Jersey	5,209,043	12,044,731	4,897,106	1,841,900	(3,055,206)
New Mexico	2,099,003	5,143,150	2,093,444	779,488	(1,313,956)
New York	21,765,804	55,549,075	22,586,413	8,253,820	(14,332,593)
North Carolina	6,759,865	16,376,781	6,664,371	2,482,852	(4,181,519)
North Dakota	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Ohio	9,467,117	23,868,078	9,715,056	3,613,699	(6,101,357)
Oklahoma	2,774,978	7,069,157	2,874,352	1,078,331	(1,796,021)
Oregon	2,620,619	6,038,972	2,458,379	917,060	(1,541,319)
Pennsylvania	10,455,078	25,434,228	10,350,227	3,835,953	(6,514,274)
Rhode Island	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
South Carolina	3,854,596	9,153,897	3,726,005	1,391,370	(2,334,635)
South Dakota	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Tennessee	4,521,227	12,289,825	4,997,310	1,861,426	(3,135,884)
Texas	23,801,705	59,655,997	24,276,455	8,966,951	(15,309,504)
Utah	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Vermont	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
Virginia	4,251,819	10,804,880	4,397,889	1,652,317	(2,745,572)
Washington	3,523,716	8,700,217	3,541,290	1,315,952	(2,225,338)
West Virginia	1,846,953	3,962,360	1,612,912	605,024	(1,007,888)
Wisconsin	3,443,011	9,172,075	3,733,263	1,360,941	(2,372,322)
Wyoming	1,294,335	3,209,375	1,305,843	483,875	(821,968)
American Samoa	335,051	824,848	335,618	124,362	(211,256)
Guam	403,739	1,017,144	413,859	153,354	(260,505)
Northern Mariana Islands	121,704	299,619	121,910	45,173	(76,737)
Puerto Rico	9,658,006	24,092,708	9,796,077	3,628,694	(6,167,383)
Virgin Islands	450,225	1,108,389	450,985	167,111	(283,874)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	1,966,079	4,875,000	1,983,559	735,000	(1,248,559)
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	5,349,875	0	5,397,440	2,000,000	(3,397,440)
Total	267,493,792	650,000,000	269,872,000	100,000,000	(169,872,000)

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

21st Century Community Learning Centers

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	15,716,821	0	17,144,294	18,089,251	944,957
Alaska	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Arizona	21,275,570	0	20,486,060	21,501,487	1,015,427
Arkansas	9,766,690	0	11,619,927	12,363,519	743,592
California	131,999,576	0	130,889,513	121,946,423	(8,943,090)
Colorado	9,927,909	0	10,786,688	12,166,413	1,379,725
Connecticut	9,015,209	0	8,493,697	8,027,951	(465,746)
Delaware	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
District of Columbia	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Florida	47,168,992	0	53,100,009	52,165,519	(934,490)
Georgia	33,303,918	0	35,343,152	38,118,282	2,775,130
Hawaii	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Idaho	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Illinois	48,340,920	0	43,572,569	45,806,595	2,234,026
Indiana	18,827,976	0	19,199,383	18,877,865	(321,518)
Iowa	5,612,966	0	5,695,690	5,811,693	116,003
Kansas	7,154,166	0	7,612,773	7,862,210	249,437
Kentucky	15,027,316	0	16,650,938	17,104,938	454,000
Louisiana	22,346,204	0	23,599,759	20,985,318	(2,614,441)
Maine	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Maryland	15,342,177	0	14,958,084	14,677,504	(280,580)
Massachusetts	17,002,191	0	18,201,626	18,265,337	63,711
Michigan	37,589,595	0	41,900,607	42,355,334	454,727
Minnesota	9,306,805	0	10,020,010	10,626,603	606,593
Mississippi	13,937,708	0	14,701,689	14,712,556	10,867
Missouri	16,390,440	0	17,926,671	16,865,966	(1,060,705)
Montana	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Nebraska	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Nevada	6,565,862	0	6,528,852	7,342,112	813,260
New Hampshire	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
New Jersey	20,170,012	0	22,306,604	20,801,710	(1,504,894)
New Mexico	8,035,977	0	8,988,528	8,882,418	(106,110)
New York	98,773,426	0	93,207,366	95,935,379	2,728,013
North Carolina	24,530,586	0	28,947,665	28,283,327	(664,338)
North Dakota	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Ohio	36,688,700	0	40,540,890	41,221,085	680,195
Oklahoma	10,056,224	0	11,883,246	12,208,705	325,459
Oregon	9,736,866	0	11,222,238	10,429,537	(792,701)
Pennsylvania	42,231,941	0	44,771,619	43,925,885	(845,734)
Rhode Island	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
South Carolina	15,373,083	0	16,506,477	15,809,131	(697,346)
South Dakota	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Tennessee	16,732,920	0	19,361,181	21,224,997	1,863,816
Texas	94,136,670	0	101,925,671	103,028,189	1,102,518
Utah	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Vermont	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
Virginia	16,560,710	0	18,207,497	18,660,441	452,944
Washington	14,840,197	0	15,089,554	15,025,606	(63,948)
West Virginia	6,775,952	0	7,909,177	6,843,146	(1,066,031)
Wisconsin	16,485,497	0	14,743,952	15,840,524	1,096,572
Wyoming	5,297,714	0	5,542,713	5,542,713	0
American Samoa	758,753	0	804,986	794,846	(10,140)
Guam	676,611	0	970,012	980,146	10,134
Northern Mariana Islands	286,421	0	292,404	288,720	(3,684)
Puerto Rico	37,329,381	0	41,358,329	41,609,029	250,700
Virgin Islands	1,019,572	0	1,081,698	1,068,072	(13,626)
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	8,070,305	0	8,162,560	8,179,876	17,316
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	10,811,662	0	11,311,660	11,311,660	0
Total	1,081,166,187	0	1,131,166,000	1,131,166,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

State Assessments

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	6,627,911	0	6,627,911	6,627,911	0
Alaska	3,582,506	0	3,582,506	3,582,506	0
Arizona	8,207,500	0	8,207,500	8,207,500	0
Arkansas	5,231,827	0	5,231,827	5,231,827	0
California	32,918,202	0	32,918,202	32,918,202	0
Colorado	6,750,164	0	6,750,164	6,750,164	0
Connecticut	5,710,938	0	5,710,938	5,710,938	0
Delaware	3,653,124	0	3,653,124	3,653,124	0
District of Columbia	3,344,879	0	3,344,879	3,344,879	0
Florida	15,883,630	0	15,883,630	15,883,630	0
Georgia	10,983,721	0	10,983,721	10,983,721	0
Hawaii	3,885,522	0	3,885,522	3,885,522	0
Idaho	4,286,349	0	4,286,349	4,286,349	0
Illinois	13,269,377	0	13,269,377	13,269,377	0
Indiana	8,112,893	0	8,112,893	8,112,893	0
Iowa	5,293,799	0	5,293,799	5,293,799	0
Kansas	5,224,636	0	5,224,636	5,224,636	0
Kentucky	6,228,945	0	6,228,945	6,228,945	0
Louisiana	6,477,064	0	6,477,064	6,477,064	0
Maine	3,928,770	0	3,928,770	3,928,770	0
Maryland	7,369,906	0	7,369,906	7,369,906	0
Massachusetts	7,698,993	0	7,698,993	7,698,993	0
Michigan	11,071,168	0	11,071,168	11,071,168	0
Minnesota	7,033,188	0	7,033,188	7,033,188	0
Mississippi	5,444,802	0	5,444,802	5,444,802	0
Missouri	7,590,619	0	7,590,619	7,590,619	0
Montana	3,713,659	0	3,713,659	3,713,659	0
Nebraska	4,407,681	0	4,407,681	4,407,681	0
Nevada	5,070,705	0	5,070,705	5,070,705	0
New Hampshire	3,992,570	0	3,992,570	3,992,570	0
New Jersey	9,706,321	0	9,706,321	9,706,321	0
New Mexico	4,581,141	0	4,581,141	4,581,141	0
New York	17,313,693	0	17,313,693	17,313,693	0
North Carolina	10,030,709	0	10,030,709	10,030,709	0
North Dakota	3,457,530	0	3,457,530	3,457,530	0
Ohio	11,968,326	0	11,968,326	11,968,326	0
Oklahoma	5,840,560	0	5,840,560	5,840,560	0
Oregon	5,787,861	0	5,787,861	5,787,861	0
Pennsylvania	12,151,657	0	12,151,657	12,151,657	0
Rhode Island	3,764,106	0	3,764,106	3,764,106	0
South Carolina	6,397,912	0	6,397,912	6,397,912	0
South Dakota	3,624,926	0	3,624,926	3,624,926	0
Tennessee	7,725,238	0	7,725,238	7,725,238	0
Texas	23,621,959	0	23,621,959	23,621,959	0
Utah	5,496,829	0	5,496,829	5,496,829	0
Vermont	3,440,162	0	3,440,162	3,440,162	0
Virginia	8,819,272	0	8,819,272	8,819,272	0
Washington	7,953,805	0	7,953,805	7,953,805	0
West Virginia	4,258,969	0	4,258,969	4,258,969	0
Wisconsin	7,293,993	0	7,293,993	7,293,993	0
Wyoming	3,398,143	0	3,398,143	3,398,143	0
American Samoa	379,140	0	379,140	379,140	0
Guam	814,624	0	814,624	814,624	0
Northern Mariana Islands	255,521	0	255,521	255,521	0
Puerto Rico	6,371,840	0	6,371,840	6,371,840	0
Virgin Islands	550,715	0	550,715	550,715	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	2,000,000	0	2,000,000	2,000,000	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	8,732,480	0	10,732,000	10,732,000	0
Total	408,732,480	0	410,732,000	410,732,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Education for Homeless Children and Youth

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	998,356	1,078,910	996,269	1,071,637	75,368
Alaska	177,205	225,433	208,312	178,787	(29,525)
Arizona	1,192,956	1,618,216	1,494,480	1,273,784	(220,696)
Arkansas	676,658	644,553	595,859	732,435	136,576
California	7,622,030	13,795,989	12,751,100	7,224,309	(5,526,791)
Colorado	628,136	924,815	854,816	720,759	(134,057)
Connecticut	494,610	336,688	310,814	475,589	164,775
Delaware	175,078	189,306	174,929	193,972	19,043
District of Columbia	218,343	175,966	162,471	231,593	69,122
Florida	3,092,149	3,124,358	2,887,565	3,090,372	202,807
Georgia	2,058,122	1,873,212	1,731,905	2,258,190	526,285
Hawaii	208,750	175,966	162,667	201,705	39,038
Idaho	217,504	212,196	195,986	225,796	29,810
Illinois	2,537,342	2,581,569	2,386,661	2,713,659	326,998
Indiana	1,118,029	959,295	886,868	1,118,356	231,488
Iowa	331,675	443,632	410,100	344,294	(65,806)
Kansas	443,311	460,431	425,165	465,770	40,605
Kentucky	969,627	1,319,915	1,220,043	1,013,325	(206,718)
Louisiana	1,374,274	1,954,563	1,806,630	1,243,205	(563,425)
Maine	240,471	186,722	172,408	241,203	68,795
Maryland	871,047	845,389	780,639	869,520	88,881
Massachusetts	1,059,927	1,118,480	1,031,705	1,082,069	50,364
Michigan	2,439,979	2,360,691	2,182,332	2,509,200	326,868
Minnesota	583,491	691,988	639,656	629,538	(10,118)
Mississippi	856,117	896,372	827,767	871,596	43,829
Missouri	1,043,916	1,054,392	974,777	999,168	24,391
Montana	198,403	175,966	162,636	211,456	48,820
Nebraska	281,994	228,080	210,867	308,005	97,138
Nevada	380,192	523,263	483,255	434,959	(48,296)
New Hampshire	174,248	190,310	175,858	186,819	10,961
New Jersey	1,298,970	908,581	838,665	1,232,328	393,663
New Mexico	523,425	548,313	506,869	526,209	19,340
New York	5,427,703	6,136,119	5,666,260	5,683,371	17,111
North Carolina	1,685,696	1,627,010	1,503,689	1,675,551	171,862
North Dakota	160,167	175,966	162,602	166,299	3,697
Ohio	2,360,799	1,913,813	1,769,364	2,442,006	672,642
Oklahoma	691,992	786,074	725,888	723,264	(2,624)
Oregon	653,500	1,030,141	952,215	617,863	(334,352)
Pennsylvania	2,607,166	1,874,497	1,732,521	2,602,243	869,722
Rhode Island	234,967	175,966	162,473	230,074	67,601
South Carolina	961,214	817,322	755,614	936,559	180,945
South Dakota	189,487	175,966	162,603	206,830	44,227
Tennessee	1,127,451	1,011,156	933,569	1,257,404	323,835
Texas	5,935,392	5,547,622	5,127,197	6,103,561	976,364
Utah	274,889	669,027	618,025	316,111	(301,914)
Vermont	160,167	175,966	162,602	163,568	966
Virginia	1,060,269	1,100,421	1,017,247	1,105,476	88,229
Washington	878,703	1,298,061	1,199,814	890,142	(309,672)
West Virginia	460,572	340,343	314,673	405,399	90,726
Wisconsin	858,578	904,290	835,942	938,419	102,477
Wyoming	160,167	175,966	162,602	163,568	966
American Samoa	16,377	17,766	16,605	16,605	0
Guam	19,734	21,907	20,477	20,477	0
Northern Mariana Islands	5,949	6,453	6,032	6,032	0
Puerto Rico	2,408,401	1,470,714	1,357,329	2,464,988	1,107,659
Virgin Islands	22,007	23,874	22,313	22,313	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	640,669	700,000	654,270	654,270	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	578,500	0	735,000	735,000	0
Total	64,066,851	70,000,000	65,427,000	65,427,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Rural and Low-Income Schools Program

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	5,132,465	0	5,183,499	5,184,184	685
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	556,447	0	561,980	562,054	74
Arkansas	3,646,838	0	3,683,100	3,683,587	487
California	1,172,679	0	1,184,339	1,184,496	157
Colorado	337,658	0	341,015	341,060	45
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	142,902	0	144,323	144,342	19
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	3,547,753	0	3,583,029	3,583,503	474
Georgia	6,251,402	0	6,313,561	6,314,396	835
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	215,027	0	217,165	217,194	29
Illinois	733,638	0	740,933	741,031	98
Indiana	677,579	0	684,316	684,406	90
Iowa	57,373	0	57,943	57,951	8
Kansas	197,384	0	199,347	199,373	26
Kentucky	5,457,600	0	5,511,866	5,512,595	729
Louisiana	4,479,547	0	4,524,088	4,524,686	598
Maine	1,964,394	0	1,983,927	1,984,189	262
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	47,084	0	47,552	47,558	6
Michigan	1,436,291	0	1,450,572	1,450,764	192
Minnesota	80,497	0	81,297	81,308	11
Mississippi	5,888,078	0	5,946,625	5,947,411	786
Missouri	3,423,969	0	3,458,015	3,458,472	457
Montana	185,093	0	186,933	186,958	25
Nebraska	70,965	0	71,671	71,680	9
Nevada	0	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	780,568	0	788,329	788,433	104
New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	1,474,291	0	1,488,950	1,489,147	197
New York	1,292,159	0	1,305,007	1,305,180	173
North Carolina	5,796,106	0	5,853,738	5,854,512	774
North Dakota	40,117	0	40,516	40,521	5
Ohio	1,962,521	0	1,982,035	1,982,297	262
Oklahoma	3,983,058	0	4,022,663	4,023,195	532
Oregon	1,264,866	0	1,277,443	1,277,612	169
Pennsylvania	974,256	0	983,943	984,073	130
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	3,723,969	0	3,760,998	3,761,495	497
South Dakota	143,070	0	144,493	144,512	19
Tennessee	4,029,583	0	4,069,650	4,070,188	538
Texas	7,344,489	0	7,417,517	7,418,497	980
Utah	0	0	0	0	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	1,760,568	0	1,778,074	1,778,309	235
Washington	995,973	0	1,005,876	1,006,009	133
West Virginia	3,587,458	0	3,623,129	3,623,608	479
Wisconsin	112,174	0	113,289	113,304	15
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	81,446	0	82,170	82,170	0
Guam	174,996	0	176,552	176,552	0
Northern Mariana Islands	54,891	0	55,378	55,378	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	118,303	0	119,355	119,355	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	429,636	0	433,455	433,455	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	100,000	0	11,344	0	(11,344)
Total	85,927,161	0	86,691,000	86,691,000	0

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

Small, Rural School Achievement Program

State or Other Area	2008 Actual	Recovery Act Estimate	2009 Estimate	2010 Estimate	Change from 2009 Estimate
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	140,200	0	141,446	141,446	0
Arizona	2,027,381	0	2,045,403	2,045,403	0
Arkansas	1,338,411	0	1,350,309	1,350,309	0
California	6,304,795	0	6,360,841	6,360,841	0
Colorado	2,077,684	0	2,096,153	2,096,153	0
Connecticut	1,174,587	0	1,185,028	1,185,028	0
Delaware	0	0	0	0	0
District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia	39,507	0	39,858	39,858	0
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	983,857	0	992,603	992,603	0
Illinois	5,699,659	0	5,750,325	5,750,325	0
Indiana	318,211	0	321,040	321,040	0
Iowa	4,288,978	0	4,327,104	4,327,104	0
Kansas	3,738,819	0	3,772,055	3,772,055	0
Kentucky	155,183	0	156,562	156,562	0
Louisiana	134,090	0	135,282	135,282	0
Maine	1,722,634	0	1,737,947	1,737,947	0
Maryland	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	1,392,956	0	1,405,338	1,405,338	0
Michigan	2,754,954	0	2,779,444	2,779,444	0
Minnesota	3,336,787	0	3,366,449	3,366,449	0
Mississippi	56,227	0	56,727	56,727	0
Missouri	5,161,717	0	5,207,601	5,207,601	0
Montana	4,806,160	0	4,848,884	4,848,884	0
Nebraska	4,258,243	0	4,296,096	4,296,096	0
Nevada	140,047	0	141,292	141,292	0
New Hampshire	1,275,782	0	1,287,123	1,287,123	0
New Jersey	1,988,288	0	2,005,963	2,005,963	0
New Mexico	496,681	0	501,096	501,096	0
New York	1,934,655	0	1,951,853	1,951,853	0
North Carolina	681,944	0	688,006	688,006	0
North Dakota	582,230	0	587,406	587,406	0
Ohio	2,541,323	0	2,563,914	2,563,914	0
Oklahoma	7,101,593	0	7,164,722	7,164,722	0
Oregon	1,444,538	0	1,457,379	1,457,379	0
Pennsylvania	349,010	0	352,112	352,112	0
Rhode Island	66,112	0	66,700	66,700	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0
South Dakota	877,960	0	885,765	885,765	0
Tennessee	119,374	0	120,435	120,435	0
Texas	8,655,115	0	8,732,054	8,732,054	0
Utah	184,454	0	186,094	186,094	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	50,280	0	50,727	50,727	0
Washington	2,236,998	0	2,256,883	2,256,883	0
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	3,278,171	0	3,307,312	3,307,312	0
Wyoming	11,566	0	11,669	11,669	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Freely Associated States	0	0	0	0	0
Indian set-aside	0	0	0	0	0
Undistributed (non-State allocations)	0	0	0	0	0
Total	85,927,161	0	86,691,000	86,691,000	0